

The Medical Missionary, vol. 16

ESM

Alonzo Trevier Jones

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1907	4
February 20, 1907	4
“A Better World” The Medical Missionary, 16, 8, p. 59.	4
“‘Unto Obedience’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 8, p. 61.	5
March 6, 1907	7
“‘How Shall We Do God’s Will?’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 10, pp. 77, 78.	7
March 20, 1907	11
“The Faith of Jesus” The Medical Missionary, 16, 12, pp. 89, 90.	11
“‘Desire Spiritual Gifts’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 12, p. 94.	14
March 27, 1907	16
“Christian Loyalty.—I” The Medical Missionary, 16, 13, p. 98.	16
“‘How to Be Faithful’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 13, p. 101.	19
April 3, 1907	22
“Christian Loyalty.—II” The Medical Missionary, 16, 14, p. 106.	22
April 10, 1907	25
“Consequences of Church Federation” The Medical Missionary, 16, 15, pp. 116, 117.	25
“‘In the Field’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 15, p. 118.	28
April 17, 1907	30
“Consequences of Church Federation. II” The Medical Missionary, 16, 16, pp. 122, 123.	30
“‘Let Him Lead’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 17, p. 126.	3330
April 24, 1907	36
“‘Desire Spiritual Gifts’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 17, p. 131.	36
May 1, 1907	38
“‘Unto Service’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 18, p. 139.	38
May 8, 1907	41
“The Christian Way with the Faulty and the Erring” The Medical Missionary, 16, 19, pp. 146, 147.	41
May 15, 1907	45
“Turning People Out of the Church” The Medical Missionary, 16, 20, pp. 154, 155.	45
May 22, 1907	50
“‘In the Field’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 21, p. 166.	50
May 29, 1907	53
“The Right of Individuality and of Conscience” The Medical Missionary, 16, 22, pp. 170, 171.	53
June 12, 1907	59
“The Baptists and Church Federation” The Medical Missionary, 16, 24, p. 187.	59
June 19, 1907	62
“The Baptists and Church Federation” The Medical Missionary, 16, 25, pp. 195, 196.	62
June 26, 1907	68
“The Catholic Church” The Medical Missionary, 16, 26, pp. 204, 205.	68
July 3, 1907	72
“The Catholic Church” The Medical Missionary, 16, 27, pp. 211, 212.	72
July 24, 1907	77

“Authority of the Church?” The Medical Missionary, 16, 30, pp. 235, 236.	77
July 31, 1907	82
“Authority of the Church” The Medical Missionary, 16, 31, pp. 243, 244.	82
August 7, 1907	86
“That Meeting in Acts 15” The Medical Missionary, 16, 32, pp. 251, 252.	86
August 14, 1907	94
“The ‘Why’ of the Religious Phase of the Sanitarium” The Medical Missionary, 16, 33, pp. 259-261.	94
THE BIBLE ITS OWN PROOF	95
HEALTH FIRST	96
SIN AND DISEASE	99
August 21, 1907	101
“The ‘Why’ of the Religious Phase of the Sanitarium.—II” The Medical Missionary, 16, 34, pp. 166, 167.	101
September 11, 1907	105
“The Everlasting Covenant Is not ‘Obey and Live’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 37, pp. 294, 295.	105
September 18, 1907	109
“The Everlasting Covenant Is not ‘Obey and Live’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 38, p. 302.	109
September 25, 1907	112
“The Everlasting Covenant Is not ‘Obey and Live’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 39, pp. 309, 310.	112
October 9, 1907	117
“Prophets and Prophesying in the New Testament” The Medical Missionary, 16, 41, pp. 323-325.	117
October 30, 1907	125
“In the Field” The Medical Missionary, 16, 44, pp. 350, 352.	125
November 20, 1907	128
“Religious Liberty” The Medical Missionary, 16, 47, pp. 369-371.	128
December 4, 1907	134
“Religious Liberty—II. As Related to the Supremacy of the Law” The Medical Missionary, 16, 49, pp. 385, 386.	134
December 11, 1907	140
“Religious Liberty—III. As Related to the Supremacy of the Law” The Medical Missionary, 16, 50, pp. 397-399.	140
December 25, 1907	146
“Religious Liberty—IV. As Related to the Church Itself” The Medical Missionary, 16, 52, pp. 413, 414.	146

1907

February 20, 1907

“A Better World” The Medical Missionary, 16, 8, p. 59.

ATJ

A. T. JONES

DO you want to get out of this world into a better one?*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.1*

If you do want this, you can have it; and if you do not want it, you are a very queer sort of person, and we should like to know more of you.*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.2*

As such a person as that would be so exceptional as fairly to be out of the list, we take it that *you* would like to get out of this world into a better one.*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.3*

Why do you want to get away from this world?*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.4*

Is it because you have to labor so hard that you are very weary? Very well, Jesus says, “Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.5*

Is it because your burden is so great that you are wearied in bearing it? Then “cast thy burden upon the Lord, and he shall sustain thee.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.6*

Is it because your cares are so many and so perplexing? Then cast “all your care upon him; for he careth for you.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.7*

Is it because you have so many griefs and so great sorrows? “He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.8*

Is it because death reigns, and holds everything under its sway? Ah! but “the sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us *the victory* through our Lord Jesus Christ,”—victory over sin, and victory over death *because* of victory over sin. For, “I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell [the grave] and of death.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.9*

Do you not see, then, that when you are *in Christ*, you are in another world? Christ is the only way out of this world into a better one. If you are Christ's, you are not of the world, because he has chosen you out of the world.*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.10*

And he is “not far from every one of us.” “Behold, I stand at the door, and knock. If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in.” And “I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee.” And “ye are complete in him.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.11*

Now will you be so inconsistent as to want to get out of this world into a better one, and find the way, and *the only way*, wide open to you, and the not go?*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.12*

Come along, friend, and let us together be “giving thanks to the Father, ... who hath *delivered us from the power of darkness*, and hath *translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son*.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 59.13*

“‘Unto Obedience’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 8, p. 61.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

THE gift of the Holy Ghost, “the sanctification of the Spirit,” is “unto obedience.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 61.1*

It is disobedience to God that has brought all the trouble and woe upon the whole world; so that the children of men are at the same time “the children of disobedience.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 61.2*

But the Lord Jesus gave himself for us, and “suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God,” that he might bring us unto the ways of obedience. “We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus *unto good works*, which God *hath before ordained* that we should walk in them.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 61.3*

But “obedience is not a mere outward compliance;” it is “the service of love.” The obedience is obedience to God. The love, then, from which springs the service, is only the love of God. “The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 61.4*

“For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 62.1*

Therefore it is written, “Ye have purified [sanctified] your souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit.” Sanctification is “of the Spirit” only. Sanctification is “through the truth” only. The Spirit is only “the Spirit of truth.” The commandments of God are only “the truth.” And true obedience to that truth can be only “through the Spirit.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 62.2*

All trying to keep the commandments, all trying to obey the truth, all trying to do anything, without the Spirit of God, is altogether vain. “God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.”*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 62.3*

“Without me ye can do nothing.” “Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” Then, strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man, Christ dwelling in the heart and filled with all the fulness of God, you and I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth us.*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 62.4*

This is sanctification of the Spirit. This is obedience. And it is sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience.*MEDM February 20, 1907, page 62.5*

March 6, 1907

“How Shall We Do God’s Will?” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 10, pp. 77, 78.

ATJ

A. T. JONES

WE pray often, some of us every day, “Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.” But how many have ever taken the time to find out just how his will is done in heaven? Yet where can there be any real point in our prayer, “Thy will be done in earth, as *it is* in *heaven*,” so long as we do not know how his will is done in heaven?*MEDM March 6, 1907, page 77.1*

Such a prayer is certain to be vague and indefinite, a mere generalization, unless we know how his will is done in heaven. But when we do know that, our prayer can be definite, positive, and full of faith, and thus with the sure result that, so far as we are concerned, his will will be done on earth precisely as it is in heaven.*MEDM March 6, 1907, page 77.2*

What a wonderful thought that is,—that the will of God will be done in us on earth just as it is done in heaven! Yet it is certainly true, or else that prayer is all in vain, and the giving of it to us by him is but a vain and tantalizing thing.*MEDM March 6, 1907, page 77.3*

But the Lord does not present to men vain things. It is intended, and it can be so, that that word shall be accomplished as certainly as it is prayed. Though, again, we say, How can this be unless we know how his will is done in heaven, so that this prayer by us can be definite, positive, and full of faith?*MEDM March 6, 1907, page 77.4*

Who are in heaven to do the will of God there?—The angels, to be sure. Then when we know how the will of God is done by them in heaven, and what they do that the will of God *may* be done in them in heaven, we can know how to pray this prayer so that it shall mean to us just what it says,—we shall know just how the will of God shall be done on earth as it is in heaven.*MEDM March 6, 1907, page 77.5*

What, then, of the angels?*MEDM March 6, 1907, page 77.6*

First: In heaven the angels “do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.” *Matthew 18:10.MEDM March 6, 1907, page 77.7*

Second: His angels harken to the voice of his word. *Psalms 103:20.* And they “do his commandments” *through* “harkening unto the voice of his word.” *MEDM March 6, 1907, page 77.8*

Third: The will of God, *as in his word*,—“as it is in heaven,”—is conveyed to the knowledge of the angels by the Spirit of God—“Withersoever the Spirit was to go, they went.” *Ezekiel 1:20.MEDM March 6, 1907, page 77.9*

Fourth: When the Spirit of God thus conveys to their knowledge the will of God, *as it is in his word*, to which the angels are “harkening,” instantly their spirit responds, and thus his will becomes at once their will, too,—“Withersoever the Spirit was to go, ... *thither was their spirit to go.*” *Verse 20.MEDM March 6, 1907, page 77.10*

Fifth: When, by the instant submission of their spirit to his Spirit, his will has become their will, the thing is done, his word is fulfilled, his will is accomplished, quick as the lightning’s flash—“Withersoever the Spirit was to go, they went, thither was their spirit to go.” “And the living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning.” *Verses 20, 14.MEDM March 6, 1907, page 77.11*

That is the way that the will of God is done in heaven. And that is the way that it is *to be* done in the earth. That is what is in the prayer, “Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.” And that is the way that his will *will be* done on earth, in every one who, knowing how his will is done in heaven, puts himself in the same attitude with those in heaven, and makes the prayer in an intelligent faith.*MEDM March 6, 1907, page 78.1*

And this attitude of the angels in heaven is precisely the attitude which it is intended that we shall hold on earth. Read, then, of ourselves:—*MEDM March 6, 1907, page 78.2*

First: We are always to behold the face of God, “in the face of Jesus

Christ.” “For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the fact of Jesus Christ.” “But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image.” *2 Corinthians 4:6; 3:18*. “Unto thee lift I up mine eyes, O thou that dwellest in the heavens. Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress; so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God.” *Psalm 123:1, 2.MEDM March 6, 1907, page 78.3*

Second: We are to hearken to the voice of his word—“Mine ears hast thou opened.” *Psalm 40:6*. “The Lord God hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back.” “He wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned.” *Isaiah 50:5, 4.MEDM March 6, 1907, page 78.4*

Third: The will of God as *in his word*, is to be conveyed to our understanding by the Spirit of God. We are to be ever dependent upon the Spirit of God for this. “Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things.” *2 Timothy 2:7*. “The Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, *he shall teach you all things*, ... whatsoever I have said unto you.” *John 14:26*. “He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak.” *John 16:13.MEDM March 6, 1907, page 78.5*

Fourth: When the Spirit of God does convey to our understanding the will of God as it is in his word, instantly our spirit is to respond, and yield submission to his Spirit, that his will may be our will. “As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.” “*The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit*, that we are the children of God.” *Romans 8:14, 16*. And “the minding of the flesh is death; but the minding of the Spirit is life and peace.” *Romans 8:6, margin.MEDM March 6, 1907, page 78.6*

Fifth: When we thus harken to his word, and receive, by his Spirit, the understanding of his will as it is in his word,—“as it is in heaven,”—and our spirit responds to his Spirit so that his will becomes our will, *then* the thing is done; his word is fulfilled, his will

is accomplished, in us on earth as it is in those in heaven: and it is done just as quickly—"as the appearance of a flash of lightning"—in our innermost, secret life, and shines through all time, openly, before those who are without. For "my word ... shall accomplish that which I please." *Isaiah 55:11*. And the word of God always acts *instantaneously*—"He spake, and it was." *Psalms 33:9*. The leper said, Lord, "If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." The Lord replied, "I will; be thou clean. And as soon as he had spoken, *immediately* the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed." *Mark 1:40-42*. *MEDM March 6, 1907, page 78.7*

Do you now see more clearly, do you understand better, *how* the will of God *is* done in heaven, and how it is *to be* done on earth? Can you now pray more intelligently, "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven?" And will you now pray directly, positively, and in full faith, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven?" *MEDM March 6, 1907, page 78.8*

March 20, 1907

“The Faith of Jesus” The Medical Missionary, 16, 12, pp. 89, 90.

ATJ

A. T. JONES

JESUS is the Author and he is the Finisher of the faith of all men.*MEDM March 20, 1907, page 89.1*

It is through Him only that men have the power, or even the privilege, to believe. For the Scripture says that John came to bear witness of Him as the Light that all men *through Him* might believe;” and that is “by Him” that we “do believe in God.” *John 1:7; 1 Peter 1:21.**MEDM March 20, 1907, page 89.2*

And yet this faith *in* Jesus, is not the faith of Jesus. “The faith *of* Jesus” is the faith of Jesus himself, the faith which he had and which he exercised in this world in the flesh to show to man and to make sure to man the way of salvation. “The faith of Jesus” is the faith that he had and that he exercised, just as truly as “the faith of our father Abraham” is the faith “which he had” and which he exercised. *Romans 4:12.**MEDM March 20, 1907, page 89.3*

This seems to be plain enough on the face of it; yet it is certainly true that Christians almost invariably look upon the phrases “faith in Jesus,” and “the faith of Jesus,” as signifying only faith in Jesus, and as referring always to the believing of men in Jesus. But the Scriptures make it too plain to be doubted or misunderstood, that the phrases “faith in Jesus” and “the faith of Jesus” refer to things that are entirely separate,—“faith in Jesus” referring to the believing of men in Jesus, as in *John 3:16*—“whosoever believeth in Him should not perish”—*Ephesians 1:15, Colossians 1:4; 2:5; Acts 26:18*, etc., etc.; and “the faith of Jesus” referring to the faith of Jesus himself personally, the faith which he exercised as man in the flesh.*MEDM March 20, 1907, page 89.4*

This latter part, the real truth as to “the faith *of* Jesus,” is so important, and is so little apprehended, that we shall quote in full

the Scriptures that certainly put it beyond all question.*MEDM March 20, 1907, page 89.5*

Galatians 3:22. “But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by *faith of Jesus Christ* might be given to them that believe.” It is impossible to have the words “*faith of Jesus*” in that verse to be equivalent to *faith in Jesus*. This is forbidden by the structure of the verse itself. For to make the words “*faith of Jesus*” mean the same as *faith in Jesus*, would force upon the writer such a meaningless repetition as that “the promise by *faith in Jesus Christ* might be given to them that have *faith in Jesus Christ*.” But taken as meaning just what it says, then the verse tells the splendid truth that the promise of God comes to men by the *faith of Jesus*, and that the promise of God which the *faith of Jesus Christ* brings to men is given and made sure *to them that believe in Jesus Christ*.*MEDM March 20, 1907, page 89.6*

Galatians 2:16. “Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but by *the faith of Jesus Christ*, even we have believed *in Jesus Christ*, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law.” Surely there is here no room for any explication. Both expressions are used in direct connection, and used in a way that makes it impossible that they should be taken as meaning the same thing. And taken for exactly what they say, again there is told the splendid truth that it is “the *faith of Jesus*” that brings to us and gives to us the justification the righteousness which we receive by believing *in Jesus*.*MEDM March 20, 1907, page 89.7*

This is shown in the same way, and just as plainly in *Romans 3:21, 22*: “But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested—even the righteousness of God which is by *faith of Jesus Christ* unto all upon all them that believe” in Jesus Christ. It is the *faith of Jesus* that has brought to us, that gives to us, and makes sure unto us and upon us, the righteousness of God, which is promised to all who believe *in him*, and which is received by *faith in him*. All this is further witnessed by the statements of Scripture that, “By the righteousness of *one* the *free gift* came upon all men unto justification of life.” “By the obedience of *one* shall many be made righteous.” “The *gift* by grace which is by *one man*, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.”*MEDM March 20, 1907, page*

By the righteousness of Christ we are justified. That righteousness of Christ was wrought, in this world and in human flesh, by the faith of Jesus Christ. By the obedience of Christ we are made righteous. That obedience of Christ, in this world and in human nature, was accomplished by the faith of Jesus. And that which the faith of Jesus has wrought for us in our flesh *which he took*, is received by us in our flesh, which we have, through faith *in* Jesus. Accordingly, “the life which I now live in the flesh, I live *by the faith of* the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me.” And this life by the faith of the Son of God, is received by us through faith *in* the Son of God. *MEDM March 20, 1907, page 89.9*

Ephesians 3:12. “In whom [Jesus] we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him.” And this boldness and access with confidence which is by the faith of Him, is received by us through faith *in* Jesus. *MEDM March 20, 1907, page 90.1*

We see then that “the faith of Jesus” has been brought to the world, and he has made it a free gift to men, the fulfillment of all the promises of God, righteousness, justification, sanctification, eternal life, and boldness and access with confidence; and that all this that is accomplished for us and is brought to us by “the faith of Jesus” is received by us through “faith *in* Jesus;” that is by simply believing in him. *MEDM March 20, 1907, page 90.2*

Yet it must not for a moment be thought that even all this is given to us by the faith of Jesus, *apart from himself*. No: He gives us *himself*, and all this *in himself* and with himself. And he himself is received by us through faith *in* him. But when he gives to us *himself* he gives to us all that is in him and of him. And one of the things that is of him is this very “faith of him.” Therefore it is true in this as in all the rest, that by faith *in* him, we actually receive the faith of him. And this faith of Jesus in us, will accomplish *in us*, in the flesh for him what it accomplished in him in the flesh for us. *MEDM March 20, 1907, page 90.3*

And this is the wonderful blessedness that is proclaimed to all men in the words of the Third Angel’s Message. “Here are they that keep the Commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.” *MEDM March*

20, 1907, page 90.4

““Desire Spiritual Gifts”” The Medical Missionary, 16, 12, p. 94.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

“DESIRE spiritual gifts.” Do you? If not, why? *MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.1*

Surely this is as plain an injunction as there is in the Bible. Why, then, should you not obey it? *MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.2*

Perhaps you will say that you have long desired to see spiritual gifts manifested in the church, and have even wondered why they were not. *MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.3*

But that is not what the Scripture says; it does not say, Desire spiritual gifts manifested in the church; but, “Desire spirit gifts;” that is, Desire them manifested *in yourself*. *MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.4*

“Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God.” *Romans 14:22*. Suppose you should see all the gifts manifested *in the church*, and yet none of them be manifested *in yourself*, what good would that do? You could even see all this, and yet be lost yourself. Do you not know that thousands, yes, *the whole world*, will see all these gifts manifested in the church, and yet it will do them no good? *MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.5*

No; this is an individual matter. True, the gifts are to be manifested in the church; but this can be only by their being manifested in *each individual member* of the church. The gifts are divided “to every man *severally*.” *MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.6*

Are you a member of the church? Do you belong to the body of Christ? Do you believe in Jesus? Then you are to desire that the gifts of the Spirit shall be manifested in yourself. If this is not so *with yourself*, you can not be ready to *meet the Lord*. *MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.7*

Yet to “desire spiritual gifts” is only a part of the injunction,—the subordinate part, too. The whole of it is, “*Follow after charity, AND desire spiritual gifts.*”*MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.8*

To desire spiritual gifts is altogether proper. Yet to do this without charity’s being held solely in view, would be altogether vain; because though we had all the gifts, and yet had not charity, it would profit us nothing, and we would be nothing.*MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.9*

Then as the only true way to desire spiritual gifts is to desire them *upon yourself*, and as the only proper connection in which to desire them is to *follow after charity* and desire them, it follows that you must follow after charity *yourself*, and desire spiritual gifts manifested upon yourself in order that you may attain that thing after which you are following.*MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.10*

And the charity after which you are to follow is the bond of perfectness, it is the love of God. And as “this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments,” then it is certain that the thing after which you are following.*MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.11*

And the charity after which you are to follow is the bond of perfectness, it is the love of God. And as “this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments,” then it is certain that the thing after which we are to follow while we are desiring spiritual gifts, is the keeping of the commandments of God. And the *keeping* of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus is the consummation of the third angel’s message.*MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.12*

There can be no true keeping of the commandments of God without charity; there can be no true charity without spiritual gifts; there can be no spiritual gifts without the gift of the Holy Ghost; therefore without the gift of the Holy Ghost, there can be no true giving of the third angel’s message.*MEDM March 20, 1907, page 94.13*

March 27, 1907

“Christian Loyalty.—I” The Medical Missionary, 16, 13, p. 98.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

CHRISTIANITY in all that in itself it is, contemplates only a Person. It has its origin only in a Person. It comes to men only from a Person. It is given to men only by a Person. It is sustained and maintained in believers only by a Person.*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.1*

Christian loyalty, therefore, is and can be only loyalty to that Person. The loyalty of Christians can never be to anybody, and much less to any thing, other than just that one Person. And that Person is God—God, in Christ, through and by the Holy Spirit.*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.2*

God is a person—a living, intelligent, person: a person who thinks, who loves, who pities, who speaks, who is good, who is true, who is faithful, who enters into covenant with men, and who keeps covenant and mercy with men forever.*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.3*

And Christ Jesus is a person. In this personal Christ the personal God is manifested to the world and made personally known to believing men. Christ, was a person before he came into the world; yea, he was a person before ever the world was. He was of the person of God before ever the world was; and as of the person of God, he “was the Word,” and he spoke the word that made the world and all the worlds. This same Person who was before the world, and who made the world and made man, came into the world and to man. He was a person in the world and with mankind. In this same person he left the world and ascended to heaven and to the personal God of heaven. In this same Person, and as this same Person glorified, he is at the right hand of the throne of the personal God in Heaven. And in this same Person, and as this same Person glorified, he is soon coming again in all the glory to glorify and take

to himself and to the personal God of glory, all who are his by a personal faith upon their own personal choice.*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.4*

And the Holy Spirit is a person. This great truth is not recognized, indeed it is not believed, by more than a very few even of Christians. For everybody knows that almost invariably, with very, very few exceptions, the Holy Spirit is referred to and spoken of by Christians as "*it*."*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.5*

But the word "*it*" *never* applies to a person. The word "*it*," in the very genius of our language, refers and applies only to things, never to persons; to things of inanimate substance, as a stone, a horse, a tree; or to things of concept, or experience, as space, height, breadth, peace, joy, grief, an impression, an influence. But the Holy Spirit is none of these: the Holy Spirit is not an influence; nor an impression, nor peace, nor joy, nor any thing. The Holy Spirit *gives* peace, and gives joy, *assuages* in grief, makes an impression, *exerts* an influence; but the Holy Spirit is none of these things, nor any other thing.*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.6*

No, eternally no! The Holy Spirit is a *Person*, eternally a divine *Person*. And he must be always recognized and spoken of as a Person, or he is not truly recognized or spoken of at all.*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.7*

See how plain and emphatic the Scriptures set forth this truth that the Holy Spirit is only a Person: and to aid the reader to see this truth, we will print in capital letters *Italic*, the words that designate the Holy Spirit:—*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.8*

John 14:16, 17: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give, you another comforter that *HE* may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; *WHOM* the world cannot receive because it (the world) seeth *HIM* not, neither knoweth *HIM*; but ye know *HIM*; for *HE* dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.9*

John 14:26: "The Comforter, the Holy Ghost, *WHOM* the Father will send in my name, *HE* shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."*MEDM*

March 27, 1907, page 98.10

John 15:26: “When the Comforter is come, *WHOM* I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which (*WHO*, Revised Version and others) proceedeth from the Father, *HE* shall testify of me.”*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.11*

John 6:7-15: “If I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; And when *HE* is come, *HE* will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.) ... I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now. Howbeit, when *HE*, the Spirit of Truth is come, *HE* will guide you into all truth; for *HE* shall not speak for *HIMSELF*; but whatsoever *HE* shall hear, that shall *HE* speak; and *HE* will shew you things to come. *HE* shall glorify me; for *HE* shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore, said I, that *HE* shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you.”*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.12*

Thus in the short space of a few lines the Lord Jesus speaks *twenty-four* times of the Holy Spirit as a person; and speaks of him in no other term than that which signifies in Greek, literally, “that person there.”*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.13*

Yet this is not peculiar to the New Testament. David said, “The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and *HIS* word was in my tongue.” [sic.] *2 Samuel 23:2.MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.14*

Note that this latter word introduces another element of personality —“the Spirit of the Lord *spake*.” This is also stated of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. Read it:—*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.15*

“Then the Spirit *said* unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot.” *Acts 8:29.MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.16*

“The Holy Spirit *said*, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.” *Acts 13:2.MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.17*

“As the Holy Ghost *saith*.” *Hebrews 3:7.MEDM March 27, 1907,*

“Well *spake* the Holy Ghost by Isaiah the prophet.” *Acts 28:25. MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.19*

Thus the Scriptures make perfectly plain the truth that the Holy Spirit is, none other than a living, speaking, divine, and eternal person. Exactly as Christ is a person and as God is a person. Indeed Jesus speaks of the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father, just as he speaks of himself as proceeding from the Father. *MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.20*

Of himself Jesus says: “I proceeded forth and came from God.” *John 8:4* Of the Holy Spirit, Jesus says that he “proceedeth from the Father.” *John 15:26. MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.21*

Therefore to be consistent those people who persist in speaking of the Holy Spirit as “it,” should also speak of Christ as “it,” and of God as “it.” But as certainly as any one speaks of God as *HE* and of Christ as *HE*, he must also speak of the Holy Spirit as *HE*. *MEDM March 27, 1907, page 98.22*

“How to Be Faithful” The Medical Missionary, 16, 13, p. 101.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

THE faithfulness of Christ is the source of all faithfulness in men. *MEDM March 27, 1907, page 101.1*

Therefore this is the basis of the divine exhortation to faithfulness: “Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers, of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus; *who was FAITHFUL* to him that appointed him.” *MEDM March 27, 1907, page 101.2*

“It behooved him *in all things* to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and FAITHFUL high priest in things pertaining to God. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted he is able to succor them that are tempted.” “For we have

no an high priest which can not be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was *in all points* tempted like as we are, yet without sin.”*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 101.3*

“Let us *therefore* come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.”*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 101.4*

Do you lack faithfulness? Then consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, who was faithful.*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 101.5*

Are you weak, so that you think it hard to be faithful?—Then consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, who was so weak that he declared, “I can of mine own self do *nothing*,” and yet “was faithful to him that appointed him.”*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 101.6*

Are you compassed with infirmity, so that you are inclined to think it hard to be faithful? Then consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, who was also “compassed with infirmity;” who “hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows;” who “himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses,” and so was really “touched with the *feelings* of our infirmities,” and yet was faithful to him that appointed him.*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 101.7*

Are you surrounded with the wicked, and sinners, and despisers of our profession, so that it seems to you difficult to be faithful? Then consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, who “endured such contradiction of sinners against himself,” and yet was faithful to him that appointed him. Consider him who resisted unto blood, striving against sin, “lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds.” Consider him who was faithful, and so be ye faithful.*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 101.8*

Let *now*, as of old, the whole multitude seek to touch him, with the touch of faith; for as then “there went virtue out of him, and healed them all,” even so it is now.*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 101.9*

Knowing your great need of faithfulness, let your faith touch him for the virtue of faithfulness, and you can be faithful to him that has

appointed you.*MEDM March 27, 1907, page 101.10*

April 3, 1907

“Christian Loyalty.—II” The Medical Missionary, 16, 14, p. 106.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

IN the preceding article it was made plain that whether it be to God, to Christ, or to the Holy Spirit, the Christian's relationship is only to a person. Christian loyalty, therefore, can never be of any other character than loyalty to that divine Person.*MEDM April 3, 1907, page 106.1*

Among Christians there can never be any such thing as parties or divisions. This is true not only in the nature of the case, but also in the word of Inspiration. In the earliest times of Christianity when such a thing appeared it was so met by the Spirit of Inspiration as to annihilate forever all possibility of it among all who would be Christians indeed.*MEDM April 3, 1907, page 106.2*

At Corinth there appeared a tendency to personal preferences, to parties, and partisanship. One said, “I am of Paul;” another, “I am of Apollos;” another, “I of Cephas.” But notice how the thing was met: “Was Paul *crucified* for you?” That one all-penetrating question reveals forever the truth that Christian loyalty can never be to any person but the One who was crucified for us. And any person who should ever ask or expect the loyalty of Christians to any person other than the crucified One, would in that very thing show *disloyalty* to Him; would in that very thing, so far as in him lay, destroy all Christian loyalty.*MEDM April 3, 1907, page 106.3*

And when this is true concerning all persons, how much more must it be true of *things*.*MEDM April 3, 1907, page 106.4*

No Christian can ever be loyal to a “cause,” for the sufficient reason that no “cause” was ever crucified for anybody, no “cause” ever created anybody, no “cause” ever made intercession for anybody “with groanings which can not be uttered.”*MEDM April 3, 1907, page 106.5*

No Christian can be loyal even to “the church;” and for the same all-sufficient reason that no church was ever crucified for anybody, never created anybody, and never made intercession for anybody “with groanings which can not be uttered.”*MEDM April 3, 1907, page 106.6*

Yet there has been much made of “loyalty to the Church,” and “loyalty to the Cause.” Indeed, there has been more than one system that would “compass sea and land to make one proselyte” to a “cause” or to “the church,” or to a certain order or system; and in the doing of it violate every principle of loyalty to Christ, to God and to the Holy Spirit.*MEDM April 3, 1907, page 106.7*

It is impossible to be otherwise. For, as already shown, loyalty to any person other than God, in Christ, under the Holy Spirit, or to anything, is in itself plain disloyalty to the divine *Person* who was crucified for us, who created us, and who makes intercession for us. And when such is the situation and course in the very beginning that all this is forgotten or ignored, it naturally enough follows that in manifesting loyalty to another person or to some “cause” or order or system, “anything to win,” anything that will make the “cause” prevail, can be counted perfectly legitimate.*MEDM April 3, 1907, page 106.8*

The Jews, in loyalty to their “cause” and to make their cause to prevail, could blaspheme the Holy Spirit, repudiate God, and crucify the Lord Jesus. From the beginning to the end of the great apostasy, in loyalty to “the Church” those who professed to be the very chief and exemplary Christians could violate every principle of Christianity, could do everything that dishonors Christ, and could persecute to the death those who were Christians indeed. In the Reformation there was renewed in the world loyalty to God, in Christ, through the Holy Spirit—loyalty to the Divine Person. But ere long this was forgotten for only a “cause,” and Protestantism, and this even as an “ism,” was espoused. Then in loyalty to the “cause,” Protestantism, so far as it had opportunity; went over the same ground as Catholicism before it; and each party, each sect in turn, went over the same ground as the one before it—always loyal to some thing, to some “ism” instead of to the divine *Person*. And the whole of history has abundantly shown, as has been well expressed

that men “will fight to the death and persecute without pity” in “loyalty” or a “cause,” who could not be persuaded to entertain a single serious thought of loyalty to the crucified and, *sanctifying Person*.*MEDM April 3, 1907, page 106.9*

On the other hand, through all the period of that dismal history there has been a bright train of blessed individuals who have been loyal, only to the divine Person, loving him, walking with him, living in him. These have been the Christians, and only Christians, always. They have been persecuted, afflicted, tormented, cast out, and this because they would not fight and persecute and sin in behalf of some “cause,” or some party, or some “ism;” but to these always loyalty to the divine Person who created us, who was crucified by us, who intercedes for us, and who sanctifies and saves us, was the only true loyalty of any soul.*MEDM April 3, 1907, page 106.10*

And such, and such only, is Christian loyalty everywhere and forever.*MEDM April 3, 1907, page 106.11*

April 10, 1907

“Consequences of Church Federation” The Medical Missionary, 16, 15, pp. 116, 117.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

CHURCH Federation is making rapid progress. From the evidences presented in the previous studies of this movement, in these columns, it was made plain that in religious federation there lies one of the world's greatest issues of present and the quickly coming time. It is not the purpose here either to repeat or to review the evidences already presented on this subject. It is important now to study the progress of the movement, and note what must be the direct consequences of its regular and constant workings.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 116.1*

Let us take for illustration the Baptists, who are just now actually involved in the discussion of this question as a practical issue upon which they are called to decide. As is well known, the Baptists have always held firmly the Christian principle of the integrity of the separate, individual, local churches; each individual church standing in its relation to the Lord just as independent of all the others as though there were no others, and it stood alone in the world. This is precisely the New Testament order, and in following it, as well as in baptism itself, the Baptists have ever been and are in the right.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 116.2*

Now the principle of Federation is another principle entirely. It is indeed the opposite principle to that of the New Testament order. To the Baptists, therefore, church federation is strictly revolutionary, and is entirely subversive of the principle and order for which they have ever stood. And yet, there are among the Baptists, leading men who are advocating federation and are arguing that the Baptists should first federate themselves into a centralized organization, and then, as such, become a part of the grand movement for the federation of all the churches into national, international, and world, federation.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page*

This, of course, is causing much discussion amongst them. It is most rife just now among the Baptists ministers of New England, and especially those of Boston and vicinity in their Monday meetings in Tremont Temple. There is opposition to the movement, and how it will be decided remains to be seen. It may be that federation will prevail. And if it does, then what will come to those who opposed it?*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 116.4*

First of all, Should those who are opposed to federation fall in with it and favor it, just because the majority favor it and carry it? When they are opposed to it on the original principles of the Baptists, and upon the true Christian principle of church-order, then should they forsake this ground and espouse the opposite, because the majority do so? Everybody who knows what principle is, will instantly say, No. For neither Christian principle nor Christian practise is ever subject to the decision of majorities.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 116.5*

Second: Even though these do not adopt federation because the majority do, then should they cease to oppose it? Should they cease to speak against it? In other words, should they cease to speak and to preach the truth of Christian principle and order, and of Baptists principle and order, because the majority have abandoned it and espoused the opposite? Again everybody who knows what principle is, what truth is, and what Christian freedom is, will instantly say, No.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 116.6*

But only the speaking and the preaching of that truth, will be opposition to federation. For them to continue and to hold and to proclaim the principles that they have always held and proclaimed, this of itself will be nothing else than opposition to federation, because federation is the opposite of those principles just as they are, even without specific reference to federation will of itself undermine federation.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 116.7*

Therefore, for any to preach these principles just as they did before, and as the principles have always been held and preached by Baptists, this will not be pleasing to the federation. And as certainly as it is displeasing to the federation, so certainly will the federation

make its displeasure felt, through slights, separation, ostracism, and denunciation. They will be denounced for “causing division,” for “opposing the good work and progress of the kingdom of God,” which the federation is so devotedly carrying forward, etc., etc.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 116.8*

And this illustration from present experience of the Baptists, is in substance what will be the experience of all the people of all the denominations in the land both in and out of the federation. For it is particularly to be noted that it is not *the people*, but only the *official bodies*, of the denominations that have formed the Federation of the Churches. Yet this officialdom of the denominations will expect that all *the people* of those denominations will promptly sanction and fall in with the federation and all that the federation shall do. But it is very probable that there will be some among those *people* who will dissent wholly from the whole scheme and even the very idea of federation. Also the federation itself may take steps and do things, from which some if not many of the people will decidedly dissent, and against which they will openly protest. But for these to do so will be held by the officialdom of the denominations and the federation, to be disrespect, presumption, treason, rebellion, etc. Then each individual will find himself face to face with the issue. Shall he think and act with the intelligence that God has given him, or shall he cease all that and surrender thought and conscience to an assumptious, hierarchial, officialdom in church and religion?*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 116.9*

Such also is in substance what will be the experience of all the people who are not of the denominations that compose the Federation. For the direct aim of the Federation is so to control legislation and the civil power as to make religion a matter of law enforced upon all. And this forces upon every person the personal individual choice and decision as to whether he will be a man and act upon his own free choice before God or whether he will allow himself to be a hypocrite enslaved in thought and conscience to the dictates of a religious despotism.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 117.1*

Thus one direct consequence of federation is that every soul will be caused to make a personal individual choice and decision on religious principle.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 117.2*

ATJ

FEBRUARY 22 till March 2 I preached in Rutland, Vt., on the world's greatest issues of the present and future days. We had a good hall in the heart of the city; and while the attendance was not as large as it should have been, it was good, and the interest increased to the end. And when the time comes to go there again, the interest will still be as good, and the attendance will be better. The mighty issues that are fast crowding upon the world are now so plainly to be seen in the current affairs of the world, that people can not fail to see the issues and catch their meaning when attention is called to these things.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 118.1*

From Rutland I went to Northfield, Vt., where I spoke three nights: The first night, on the Eastern Question, in the Methodist Church; the second night, on National Temperance and Intemperance, in the Congregational Church; and the third night, on Christian Health and How to Have It, in the Unitarian Church. This arrangement of the meetings was made by the three ministers of the three churches named so as to give all the best opportunity to attend the meetings. The ministers themselves attended the meetings and were much pleased with the discussion of the subjects. Thus at Northfield, too, there are doors wide open whenever the time comes to go there again.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 118.2*

From Northfield I went to Boston and preached at noon each day, Tuesday to Friday, March 12-15, in the Bromfield St. Methodist Church, on the Easter Question and Temperance; Wednesday night, in the Bowdoin Square Baptist Tabernacle, on Temperance; and Sunday night, March 17, in the Flint St. M. E. Church, Somerville, on The Place of the Holy Spirit in the World and in the Church. There were other openings in Boston and I arrived there, but circumstances with which I had nothing to do postponed these for at least three weeks. I decided then to spend this time in other places, and to return to Boston, April 19, and preach on Church Federation till the 18th; because *then* that will be an especially live subject in Boston.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 118.3*

These questions are the individual, the local, the state, the national, and the world, issues now and forward, and must be discussed before the people everywhere.*MEDM April 10, 1907, page 118.4*

ALONZO T. JONES.

April 17, 1907

“Consequences of Church Federation. II” The Medical Missionary, 16, 16, pp. 122, 123.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

WE have seen that one certain consequence of church federation is and will be slights, ostracism, and discredit,—in a word, *persecution*—against and upon all who choose to dissent from the principles and workings of federation. For it must not be forgotten that a word, or even a sneer or a slight, is by the Scriptures declared to be persecution: and it is persecution as really as is imprisonment or other physical violence done in *Genesis 21:9* it is written that “Sarah saw the son of the Egyptian ... *mocking*.” But in *Galatians 4:26* the Spirit of Inspiration, referring to the same incident, says, “He that was born after the flesh *persecuted* him that was born after the Spirit.” Ishmael’s boyish mockery of Isaac, was persecution. Of itself the boyish mockery was no violence; but it revealed the heart’s disposition of the mocker, and showed what he would readily do if circumstances and opportunity were more favorable. And federation beginning with persecution by slights or sneers or words, will easily enough proceed to stronger modes of expressing its disapproval of dissent or in opposition. *MEDM April 17, 1907, page 122.1*

Not upon any reasonable basis can this be doubted. For federation is not proposed as a matter of mere social diversion, or ecclesiastical amusement. It is proposed as the practical means of turning the kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of God, of saving mankind from itself; and whatever opposes federation or weakens its operation or effectiveness must necessarily be construed as positively inimical to the truest good of mankind, and as treason and rebellion against the kingdom of God. And anything that will effectually quench such supreme evils as these, will in the nature of the case be entirely justifiable and even laudable. *MEDM April 17, 1907, page 122.2*

All history witnesses to the correctness of this analysis. Hence the perfect aptness of Bishop Forsler's note of warning to the first essay at national federation of churches, Dec. 1905. "Human nature has not changed."*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 122.3*

National federation of Protestantism proposes to expand into international federation of Protestantism, and this into international federation with Catholicism; and this into world-federation of religion including the Christian-dubbed paganism of Japan and China; thus composing one grand world and imperialistic religion.*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 122.4*

But what has been the record of world religions?*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 122.5*

The first one was paganism established and imperialized by Nimrod. And its procedure was such as to distinguish him forever as the "exceedingly imperious rebel" and "overbearing tyrant in Jehovah's sight."*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 122.6*

Again in Egypt paganism arose to a strictly world supremacy, and by oppression and cruelty caused the name of Egypt with its Pharaoh to stand forever as the most expressive symbol of darkness, degradation, and bondage of blind unreasoning, cruelty, despotism, and oppression toward men; and of arrogant insolence and presumptuous defiance toward God.*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 122.7*

And even among the people of God paganism succeeded in creeping in and establishing a throne and itself upon it. That woman Jezebel brought into the kingdom of Israel her pagan religion and made it predominant there, supported and made effective by all the machinery and power of the kingdom. The consequence was that the persecution, despotism was so deadly that though there were in all the kingdom yet seven thousand who stood true to God and themselves, they were so scattered that not one of them knew where another was. *1 Kings 19:10, 14, 18.**MEDM April 17, 1907, page 122.8*

But it was in Rome another empire that paganism attained its perfect idea in every respect. And the consequence was that it

systematically sapped men of every vestige of individuality and carried them into a boundless sea of ruinous excess of iniquity. And when Christ came with his religion of divine power and virtue to save mankind from the sea of iniquity, and restore to him his native God-given individuality, paganism with all the power of the might Rome crucified him out of the world and unrelentingly persecuted his disciples and even the very name of his religion, for two hundred and fifty years.*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 122.9*

Then a new turn was taken, and a new world-religion was established—the papacy. And for more than eleven hundred years it was the same dismal story continued, and deeply intensified in every feature. And again mankind was systematically sapped of every vestige of individuality, and swept into a boundless sea of iniquity.*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 122.10*

But in the Reformation God gave again the religion of divine power and virtue of the faith of Christ, to save man from that sea of iniquity and restore them to the native God-given individuality. Yet alas! religious and church professing reformation principles, swing away from those principles to centralized, governmental, and State religion, and continued the same old story of despotism, oppression, and persecution, always to the full extent of the world power obtained. And now all of these go about to form a federation to secure national preference and national power. That accomplished, will then the leopard suddenly change his spots—yes, his whole very nature, and become an innocent veritable lamb?—No. The same old nature will still show itself, and still to the full extent of the worldly power gained.*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 122.11*

And when this national and international federation of religion culminates in the world-religion that is proposed, planned, and promised—that world-religion composed only of the elements of these three religions, paganism, papacy, and false protestant, that have made an unbroken record of wickedness, despotism, oppression, and persecution always to the full extent of the world-power obtained—what can then be the only possible consequence?—Nothing less and nothing else than a world-despotism, world-oppression, and world-persecution; all individuality again denied

and all the world swept into, and finally sunk in, a boundless sea of iniquity.*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 122.12*

And again, as always before, there will be those who by virtue of the religion of divine power of God in Christ under the Holy Spirit will not bow the knee, nor kiss the hand, nor in any other way worship according to the doctrines and dictates of that world-religion. As always before, also, these will be few. Also as before, yes, even as in the time of Elijah under that original woman Jezebel, they will be so few and so scattered that one will not know where another is. Yet these as always before standing free in God, in their native God-given individuality and Christian integrity, will “sing for the majesty of the Lord” and will be gathered “one by one” by the glorious Lord when he appears in his glory. *Isaiah 24:11, 14; 27:12.MEDM April 17, 1907, page 123.1*

Thus individuality, in individual Christian integrity, as the eternal principle in righteousness that it is, is gloriously vindicated and made triumphant by the Lord of Hosts; while federation, confederation, fails and falls in annihilating him by its own impotence, arrogance, presumption, and blasphemy.*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 123.2*

“Say ye not, a confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, a confederacy ... Sanctify the Lord of Hosts *himself* ... and he shall be for a sanctuary.”*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 123.3*

“Let Him Lead” The Medical Missionary, 16, 17, p. 126.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

“AS many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God;” and “there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.”*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 126.1*

To be led of the Spirit and to walk after the Spirit are clearly the same thing. Then it is clear that the Holy Spirit is to show us the way in which we should walk. As it is written, “He will guide

you.”*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 126.2*

“I am the Lord thy God which teacheth thee by the way that thou shouldest go.” The only object in giving a guide to anybody, the only thing a guide is to do, is to show the right way; and the only thing that anybody can rightly do who has a guide, is to follow him.*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 126.3*

It is preposterous to claim to have a guide, and then go our own way. Then the very claim that we have, or that we need, a guide, demands of us that we put ourselves wholly in his charge, that we give ourselves up absolutely to his direction.*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 126.4*

“It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps.” “All we like sheep have gone astray,” and do not know the way. The great Shepherd of the sheep has given us a guide to be with us forever. This guide is the Holy Spirit. You and I claim to need this guide. Indeed, we claim to have this guide with us as ours. Now have you put yourself wholly in his charge? Have you given up yourself absolutely to his direction?*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 126.5*

“I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way which thou shalt go; I will counsel thee with mine eye upon thee. Be ye not as the horse, or as the mule, which have no understanding; whose trappings must be bit and bridle to hold them in.”*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 126.6*

Do you study, and inquire, and watch, only to know His way?*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 126.7*

And when he indicates the way, even only with his eye, do you promptly walk that way? or do you hesitate and parley, and want to know whether there is not another way?*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 126.8*

Do you always treat him implicitly as the guide? or do *you* assume the position of guide? Do you try to guide your Guide?*MEDM April 17, 1907, page 126.9*

Don't be “as a horse,” or “a mule;” be a Christian.*MEDM April 17,*

April 24, 1907

““Desire Spiritual Gifts”” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 17, p. 131.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

“DESIRE spiritual gifts.” Do you? If not, why? *MEDM April 24, 1907, page 131.1*

Surely this is as plain an injunction as there is in the Bible. Why, then, should you not obey it? *MEDM April 24, 1907, page 131.2*

Perhaps you will say that you have long desired to see spiritual gifts manifested in the church, and have even wondered why they were not. *MEDM April 24, 1907, page 131.3*

But that is not what the Scripture says; it does not say, Desire spiritual gifts manifested in the church; but, Desire them manifested *in yourself*. *MEDM April 24, 1907, page 131.4*

“Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God.” *Romans 14:22*. Suppose you should see all the gifts manifested *in the church*, and yet none of them be manifested *in yourself*, what good would that do? You could even see all this, and yet be lost yourself. Do you not know that thousands, yes, *the whole world*, will see all these gifts manifested in the church, and yet it will do them no good? *MEDM April 24, 1907, page 131.5*

No; this is an individual matter. True, the gifts are to be manifested in the church; but this can be only by their being manifested in *each individual member* of the church. The gifts are divided “to every man severally.” *MEDM April 24, 1907, page 131.6*

Are you a member of the church? Do you belong to the body of Christ? Do you believe in Jesus? Then you are to desire that the gifts of the Spirit shall be manifested in yourself. If this is not so *with yourself*, you can not be ready to meet the Lord. *MEDM April 24, 1907, page 131.7*

Yet to “desire spiritual gifts” is only a part of the injunction,—the subordinate part, too. The whole of it is, “*Follow after charity, AND desire spiritual gifts.*”*MEDM April 24, 1907, page 131.8*

To desire spiritual gifts is altogether proper. Yet to do this without charity’s being held solely in view, would be altogether vain; because though we had all the gifts, and yet had not charity, it would profit us nothing, and we would be nothing.*MEDM April 24, 1907, page 131.9*

Then as the only true way to desire spiritual gifts is to desire them *upon yourself*, and as the only proper connection in which to desire them is to *follow after charity* and desire them, it follows that you must follow after charity *yourself*, and desire spiritual gifts manifested upon yourself in order that you may attain that thing after which you are following.*MEDM April 24, 1907, page 132.1*

And the charity after which you are to follow is the bond of perfectness, it is the love of God. And as “this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments,” then it is certain that the thing after which we are to follow while we are desiring spiritual gifts, is the keeping of the commandments of God. And the *keeping* of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus is the consummation of the third angel’s message.*MEDM April 24, 1907, page 132.2*

There can be no true keeping of the commandments of God without charity; there can be no true charity without spiritual gifts; there can be no spiritual gifts without the gift of the Holy Ghost; therefore without the gift of the Holy Ghost, there can be no true giving of the third angel’s message.*MEDM April 24, 1907, page 132.3*

May 1, 1907

“Unto Service” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 18, p. 139.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

THE baptism of the Holy Spirit is only unto service *MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.1*

Anybody who wants the baptism, or the gift, of the Holy Ghost, in order that he may be lifted up in an ecstasy and kept there, swinging, like a canary, in an ecstatic feeling the rest of his days, will never get it. *MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.2*

Yet this is about the idea that thousands of people have of the purpose and the effect of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Therefore their favorite song is,—*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.3*

“O, could I ever, ever stay *MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.4*

In such a frame as this, *MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.5*

I’d sit and sing myself away *MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.6*

To everlasting bliss!” *MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.7*

Christ never was in such a “frame” as this, thank the Lord; if he had been, we should be eternally lost. But those people *think* that such is exactly the “frame” that becomes heaven. Yet if they would *really think*, they would see in a moment that it is altogether a false conception. *MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.8*

Jesus was in heaven. He was there the possessor, by divine right forevermore, of all the bliss that heaven can possibly know. Yet, knowing and possessing all this, *he* did not sit and sing himself away to everlasting bliss. *MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.9*

No. He left it all behind, and came down to earth, and spent his life here in the service of a poor, ruined people, laden with iniquity, to

bring to these the knowledge of God, and all the good which that knowledge brings.*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.10*

And to him this was bliss. To him this was more than to be in heaven itself. It was not to him *more* nor less than heaven itself; it simply *was* heaven itself; for when he came down to earth, he did not, strictly speaking, leave heaven behind—he *brought it along*, and linked it to earth in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten.*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.11*

To him this was better than to stay in heaven. He voluntarily chose to do this; therefore he did it because he would rather do it than to stay in heaven.*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.12*

Thus of his own free choice he came out of heaven to the earth, and stayed here as long as men would let him stay.*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.13*

As long as he could stay here and work for mankind, he would rather do so than go to heaven.*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.14*

And this is Christianity.*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.15*

Unto this glorious mission the Lord Jesus was born of the Holy Ghost, and was baptized and anointed with the Holy Ghost. And this is the purpose of the birth, the baptism, and the anointing of the Holy Spirit, upon every soul who receives him.*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.16*

“God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who *went about doing good*.” “The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; *because* he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.”*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.17*

This is what the baptism of the Holy Ghost was for then; and this is what it is for forever.*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.18*

What an astonishing conception of Christianity it is, indeed, that he who had received the greatest degree of its spirit should forget

everybody but himself; and thinking nothing, caring nothing, for the sin, the distress, and the misery of the multitudes of the lost all around him, should “sit” pampering himself in a hilarious mood, and “sing himself away to everlasting bliss!”*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.19*

Such is not the Spirit of Christianity. It is simply the spirit of the supremely selfish, shirking, lazy loafer.*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.20*

No; the spirit of Christianity is the spirit of the Lord Jesus himself, and he who has the greatest degree of it, instead of *sitting* and singing *himself* away to everlasting bliss, *stands up*, in the conscious surety of everlasting bliss, and *works* with all power in heaven and earth, and sings *while he works*, to draw *all others* from the darkness and woe of this world of sin, unto the everlasting bliss of the glorious liberty of the sons of God.*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.21*

He does not care to go to heaven till his work in the world is done. Give him his choice any day, and he would rather stay in this world, and *work*, than to go to heaven. He knows that in Christ, who is his life, heaven is sure to him. And having found in his blessed Lord, and by his Spirit, the connection between heaven and earth, to him it is heaven to work to get other people into the knowledge and surety of heaven.*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.22*

O, let us be only such Christians as Christ was in the world! Then we shall be of profit to the world, and the world will know that God sent Jesus into the world.*MEDM May 1, 1907, page 139.23*

May 8, 1907

“The Christian Way with the Faulty and the Erring” The Medical Missionary, 16, 19, pp. 146, 147.

ATJ

A. T. JONES

IN the church which is the body of Christ, “the members have the same care one of another.” There is no exclusiveness among them. There is no slighting of one by any of the others. There is no envy or detraction of one that is honored or advanced. If “one member suffer, all the members suffer with it;” if “one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it.” *MEDM May 8, 1907, page 146.1*

Such only is the spirit that is manifested in the Church of Christ which is his body. And in his church this is the only spirit that is manifested toward the faulty and the erring. It is only according to this spirit that in the Scriptures directions are given for dealing with the faulty and the erring. It is only in this spirit that the Scripture directions can be followed. For the church of Christ is subject to Christ “in everything.” *MEDM May 8, 1907, page 146.2*

Accordingly it is written, “If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual *restore* such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou be also tempted.” *Galatians 6:1*. The only thought or purpose toward the one that is “in a fault,” is the thought and purpose of *restoring* him—the bringing of him back and setting him in his true place, and this *by the spiritual*, and in the spirit of meekness and of Christian fellowship “considering *thyself* lest thou also be tempted.” *MEDM May 8, 1907, page 146.3*

Further, the Scripture directions in this matter contemplate only that the individuals and the church shall go to the utmost limit in the Christian effort to restore the faulty and erring one. And so it is written, “If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother.” The only purpose of going to him and telling him his fault, is to *gain* him, to restore him; and if he hear thee “thou hast

gained him.”MEDM May 8, 1907, page 147.1

“But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.” If he will not hear you, and so you fail to gain him, when you speak to him alone, then try again, with the presence of one or two more that may witness and aid the endeavor to gain him.*MEDM May 8, 1907, page 147.2*

And if he neglect to hear them, even then do not cease the endeavor to gain him. “If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church.” Then the church in its membership is still to endeavor to gain him from his fault and his error. And it is only when he still refuses to listen to the efforts of the whole church—only then ceases the special, Christian, brotherly effort to gain him and restore him.*MEDM May 8, 1907, page 147.3*

“But if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.” He has then refused all endeavors individually and collectively of the whole brotherhood of the church proceeding upon the word of God and in the Spirit of Christ, and thus has separated himself from the fellowship of the brotherhood and has put himself decisively on the ground of those outside of the Christian fellowship, and the church, having done all that can be done, now lets him be just as are the others who are outside the Christian fellowship—lets him be as an heathen man and a publican.*MEDM May 8, 1907, page 147.4*

And note, the direction is that he is now to be considered only as a heathen and publican, to whom the gospel is ever to be preached for his conversion and salvation, as really as though he had never been of the Christian fellowship at all. The following excellent words, written by another, beautifully cover the whole ground: —*MEDM May 8, 1907, page 147.5*

“If he will not hear them, then, and not until then, the matter is to be brought before the whole body of lecturers. Let the members of the church, as representatives of Christ, unite in prayer and loving entreaty that the offender may be restored. The Holy Spirit will speak through his servants, pleading with the wanderer to return to God. Paul, the apostle, speaking by inspiration, says, ‘As though

God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God.' He who rejects this united overture, has broken the tie that binds him to Christ and thus has severed himself from the fellowship of the Church. Henceforth, said Jesus, 'let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.' But he is not to be regarded as cut off from the mercy of God. Let him not be despised or neglected by his former brethren, but be treated with tenderness and compassion, as one of the last sheep that Christ is still seeking to bring to the fold." *MEDM May 8, 1907, page 147.6*

This order of procedure is the only one recognized in the Scriptures in dealing with the faulty and the erring in the church. In the instruction to Timothy it is clearly referred to in the words, "Against an elder receive not an accusation, but *before two or three witnesses*." And this is so important that it is made the subject of one of the most solemn charges in all the Bible: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality." *1 Timothy 5:19-21. MEDM May 8, 1907, page 147.7*

In the instructions to Titus also this order of procedure is recognized and required, in the words, "A man that is an heretic *after the first and second admonition* reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." *Titus 3:10, 11*. As already shown, when he has refused to hear the two or three, and then has refused to hear the whole church, when they have done all that they can to gain and restore him, then he has separated *himself*, and is condemned of himself; the church can do no more and "lets him be" in the position and the separation in which, against all the efforts of the church, he has placed himself. *MEDM May 8, 1907, page 147.8*

Again this order of procedure is recognized by Paul himself as governing himself. Concerning those who had sinned and had "not repented of the uncleanness, and fornication, and lasciviousness which they have committed," he says, "This is the third time I am coming to you. *In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established*." *2 Corinthians 12:21, 13:1. MEDM May 8, 1907, page 147.9*

Such is the order of procedure, and such is the only true order of procedure, and such is the “care” and the manifestation of the loving, honoring, and honorable “care” that the members of the church of Christ have “one of another.”*MEDM May 8, 1907, page 147.10*

Only when this order of procedure is followed faithfully in the spirit and to the letter—only then is the action of either members or the church ratified in heaven. And since the church, as well as each individual Christian, must be “subject to Christ in everything,” any action taken by any individual member, or by the church, other than strictly according to the order thus plainly laid down in the Scriptures, is utterly without the authority or the approval of heaven, and is only arbitrary, human, and anti-Christian.*MEDM May 8, 1907, page 147.11*

It may be noticed that in this article nothing has been said about *turning members out of the church*, but only of efforts to *gain*, to *restore*, and to *keep them in*. The *turning of them out*, will be considered next.*MEDM May 8, 1907, page 147.12*

May 15, 1907

“Turning People Out of the Church” The Medical Missionary, 16, 20, pp. 154, 155.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

LAST week, in the study of the Scriptures, we found that in the church of Christ, in dealing with any who are in fault, the only procedure prescribed, is for the gaining and restoring of them and the keeping of them in the church if possible. We found that in the New Testament there is no provision made for turning people out of the church, and that there is no procedure to be undertaken in the spirit or with the design of turning persons out of the church, but only for gaining and restoring them and keeping them in; and that every effort is to be exhausted to accomplish this. And when the one who is in the fault refuses and stands out against all these efforts, then, of his own choice and by his own course, he *is out* of the church. Recall the words in the quotation given: “He who rejects this united overture *has... severed himself* from the fellowship of the church;” and also the words of Scripture, “He that is such is subverted and sinneth, being condemned *of himself.*” *MEDM May 15, 1907, page 154.1*

However, while there is not in the New Testament any provision made for turning people out of church, there is in the New Testament a plain account of the thing. And here it is, “I wrote unto the church; but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words; and not content therewith, neither does he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would and *casteth them out of the church.*” *3 John 9, 10. MEDM May 15, 1907, page 154.2*

This shows that the spirit and working that turns people out of church, is altogether different from that of the New Testament, which exhausts every effort “in the spirit of meekness” to “gain” to “restore,” and to keep in the church those who have been

“overtaken in a fault.”*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 154.3*

First, it springs from the love of having the preeminence; and by this of itself, and at the one first step, the man who has it puts himself in the place of Christ. For in the church of Christ, and with every Christian, Christ “is the head of the body, the church, ... that in all things *he* might have the preeminence.” In the church of Christ and with all Christians there is no such thing as eminence; even much less is there any such thing as *pre*-eminence; for there, “One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren,” and each one is servant to all. Whosoever therefore would love to have only eminence among Christians, has another spirit than that of Christ; but when anyone loveth to have the *pre*-eminence, that is at once to put himself in the place of Christ himself, and is of the very spirit of anti-Christ. For whenever anyone puts himself in the place of Christ he is certain to act unlike Christ; and that is anti-Christ.*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.1*

Second: The next step was exactly in accord with his putting himself in the place of Christ—he took it upon himself to decide just what the church should receive or not receive. A letter was written “to the church;” but Diotrephes would not allow the church to receive it. This letter was written by John, a chosen apostle of the Lord Jesus; and was written to a church of the Lord Jesus. It was therefore the word of Christ to his own Church. But Diotrephes would not himself receive the letter, and would not let the church receive it; and repudiated even Christ’s apostle who wrote the letter, and prated against him with malicious words.*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.2*

Third: He would not even receive the brethren by whom the letter was sent. And when some of the brethren of the church had the mind and heart to receive those brethren, Diotrephes forbade them. And when some of the members of the church disregarded his command, and received those brethren, then he *cast them out of the church*.*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.3*

Such is the procedure, and that is the only kind of procedure, by which people are turned out of the church. But it is not Christian procedure; it is papal procedure, and that alone. All that the papacy

has ever been is revealed in this account of the procedure of Diotrephes—the love of preeminence, in which he put himself in the place of Christ, and opposed and exalted himself above Christ and above his word; usurped the authority over Christ’s servants; and assumed, and presumed to exercise, the satanic prerogative of *severing from Christ’s body his own members*, and casting them out.*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.4*

Thus in that procedure by Diotrephes there is in the beginning of that long course of apostasy that made the man of sin, the mystery of iniquity, in all that it had ever been or ever can be. For, all the indications are that this affair of Diotrephes occurred at Ephesus. And to the elders of the church at Ephesus Paul had already said, years before, “Of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them;” “grievous wolves, not sparing the flock.” And Ephesus is the name chosen by the Lord Jesus himself as representative of the first of the Seven Churches—that one that had left her first love.*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.5*

This apostasy exemplified in Diotrephes continued. He was followed by others who loved to have the preeminence, and the number of these multiplied; for such is the spirit of the carnal mind and of the natural heart. These who thus exalted themselves to the preeminence, assumed to themselves *only* the title of *bishop*, while the others in the same office precisely must be designated as only presbyters. And it was only a few years before these self-exalted “bishops” and their supporters actually taught the following blasphemous stuff:—*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.6*

“It is manifest that we should look upon the bishop, even as we would upon the Lord himself.”*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.7*

“He who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, does in reality serve the devil.”*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.8*

A few years more and they had got far enough along to teach the following of the same sort:—*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.9*

“The church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the church is controlled by these same rulers.”*MEDM May 15, 1907,*

“Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the church and the church in the bishop, and *if any one is not with the bishop*, that *he is not in the church*.”*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.11*

But, as we have seen, in the church where Diotrephes was, there were some Christians who disregarded his preeminence and would not recognize his commands. There were likewise in all the churches true Christians who disregarded the preeminence of these self-exalted bishops, and would not obey their wicked commands, but would honor and obey Christ instead. And, like the Christian in the church where Diotrephes was, these too were “cast out of the church” and denounced of heresy, apostasy, and of causing diversion. The following is an example of this:—*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.12*

“Neither have heresies arisen, nor have schisms originated, from *any other source than from this*, that God’s priest is not obeyed; nor do they consider that there is one person for the time, priest in the church, and for the time judge in the stead of Christ; whom if, according to divine teaching, the whole fraternity should obey, no one would stir up anything against the college of priests; ... no one would rend the church by a division of the unity of Christ.”*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.13*

Then just because these were thus denounced and cast out of the church, and were thus counted as outside “the pale of unity,”—of the bishops—the churches were warned against them as heretics and not to be listened to. They might be teaching in perfect Christian faithfulness the very truth of Christ, even just as they had taught it before they disobeyed the bishops and were denounced as heretics, yet *that* could not be recognized now; and so it was flatly declared that it mattered not what they might teach, and that no one need even to ask “*what*” any of these might be teaching; so long as he teaches *out of the “pale of unity.”**MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.14*

And this “pale of unity” was nothing else than the arbitrary assumption and presumption of the monarchical and despotic “bishops” who loved to have the preeminence, and would cast out

of the church every one who would not recognize and bow to
it.*MEDM May 15, 1907, page 155.15*

May 22, 1907

“In the Field” The Medical Missionary, 16, 21, p. 166.

ATJ

AS stated in the previous report, my work in Boston very unexpectedly closed up for the time about two weeks before the time arranged for. Therefore, leaving Boston Monday evening, March 18, I arrived in Newark, N. J., Tuesday, the 19th. This in turn brought me to this place about two weeks earlier than any one expected. But, the announcement was circulated, and the meetings were begun Thursday night, the 21st, and continued every night and Sabbaths and Sundays, including the 31st. The attendance was good, and the interest also. The subjects presented here, were the same in substance as in other places. The Eastern Question showing the nearness of the end of all things and what is the preparation to escape all these things that shall come to pass; Church Federation leading to world federation or religion and world despotism and destruction; and the truth of Christ and of the Church of Christ that saves from that deception and destruction. For these are the great world-issues of the present time; and to know the truth concerning these things and the way of escape, is the great thing that needs to be preached to all people in this time. The experience met in Boston on the question of Church Federation that was being discussed amongst the Baptists only added freshness and point to that phase of the truth that was presented; for this demonstrated that the discussion of church federation was not merely theoretical. but very practical; and was not the pointed out of something yet to come, but the discussion of a very present and living issue, the very serious meaning of which it was not at all difficult to discern.*MEDM May 22, 1907, page 166.1*

From Newark I went to Washington, D. C. and began meetings Wednesday night, April 3, and continued to Sunday night, April 14. The attendance here was larger than at any other place that I had been on this tour. Only once or twice was the attendance less than about three hundred. Here, too, the interest was excellent, prominent educators of the city of Washington being amongst the hearers. One of these, the principal of one of the Manual Training

Schools of the city, was present when I spoke on the Eastern Question, and invited me to come and present that question to his school on Wednesday morning, April 10, I went and found there present to hear about four hundred students and teachers with the principal. These were all deeply interested in the subject and expressed with thanks their hearty approval of the presentation of that great question. The interest in the meetings increased from the beginning until the very end; the last night the attendance being more than could get into the house. And the interest was such that I was required to promise that I would visit them again.*MEDM May 22, 1907, page 166.2*

Leaving Washington April 16, I went again to Boston, speaking Sunday afternoon, April 21, to a large audience in Berkeley Hall on "Patriotism in the United States." Monday, April 22, I attended the Baptist ministers' meeting in their hall in Tremont Temple, and had the pleasure of listening to the reading of a paper by Prof. Geo. E. Horr, D. D., in opposition to church federation. Then at the noon-hour Tuesday, April 23, and daily throughout the week I discussed in Wesleyan Hall the subject of church federation as to what is proposed therein, and what is in truth therein; and the Christian truth that must be followed by all those who will obey the Word of God and say not "A Confederacy to all them to whom this people shall say A Confederacy," but will "sanctify the Lord of Hosts Himself."*MEDM May 22, 1907, page 166.3*

Then incidentally I found that I was not the only one that was just then discussing that great question and presenting the truth of the Lord's Message of deliverance from the evils assured in Church Federation. For, one day, I had the privilege of hearing a man, who was a perfect stranger to me, declare to an assembly of people that this movement for church federation means only the final Babylon of the Book of Revelation and the culmination of anti-christ; and he gave the word "Come out of her, my people." That same day in another hall in Boston a friend of mine heard another preacher, having no connection with the one already mentioned, declare the same thing. Both, these were des out men of God and cited the Book of Revelation as the source of their information on that subject. This is only another token that that movement for church federation is one of the greatest issues now before the world, and

that God is finding voices who will proclaim the truth from His Word on that subject.*MEDM May 22, 1907, page 166.4*

Sunday, April 28, I again addressed a large assembly in Berkeley Hall on "Church Federation" and what it means to this nation and to the world. There, too, the assembly was so interested that by unanimous rising vote they expressed their appreciation of the truth presented and their invitation that I should come and speak to them again.*MEDM May 22, 1907, page 166.5*

I left Boston Sunday night, April 28, and arrived at home in Battle Creek, Tuesday night, April 30; thus closing an absence of ten weeks of blessed opportunities to proclaim the truth for this time to those who had not heard it and ready to take up again the regular work in the Sanitarium to the same purpose as the work done In The Field.*MEDM May 22, 1907, page 166.6*

ALONZO T. JONES.

May 29, 1907

“The Right of Individuality and of Conscience” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 22, pp. 170, 171.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

IN the preceding article we studied the principles and the practice of the Church as illustrated in the Scripture instance of Diotrephes and the historical development of Diotrephes’s procedure in the making of the papacy.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.1*

There is another phase of that scripture account of Diotrephes that should be noticed. That is, the case as it relates to the membership of the Church, the domination of which was seized by Diotrephes. And that this may be studied to the best advantage, we set down here again the verses of Scripture that tell it:—*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.2*

“I wrote unto the church: but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the church.” *John 9, 10. MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.3*

From the plain scripture record it is evident that not all of the members of that Church disregarded the arrogance and commands of Diotrephes. It is evident that some and apparently the majority, did yield to the will of Diotrephes. For if the whole church had disregarded his will and commands, it could not be said that he cast them out of the church; and even if the majority had disregarded him, it could then hardly be said that he “casteth them out of the church” for that would be, in effect, casting out the church itself, and not the casting of certain ones out of the church. Therefore, by the text, it seems that the majority of the church submitted to the arrogance and commands of Diotrephes. Yet it is perfectly plain that

there were some who would not submit to this, but did disregard it; and to the extent that they were cast out of the church by him. And they were willing to be cast out of the church by him, rather than to submit to him in the position and authority which he had assumed.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.4*

Now it stands on the very face of the whole narrative that Diotrephes was wholly wrong.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.5*

1. He loved to “have the preeminence among them;” which, as we have seen, was at once to put himself in the place and position of Christ.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.6*

2. He refused to allow the Word of Christ through His apostle to come to the church.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.7*

3. He prated against the apostle “with malicious words.”*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.8*

4. He refused to receive Christian brethren.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.9*

5. He assumed authority to command Christ’s servants and forbid them to receive other Christian brethren.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.10*

6. And when some disregarded his assumption, he cast them out of the church.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.11*

In every one of these things Diotrephes was wrong; and those who refused to recognize or submit to him in those things, were in the right and did right.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.12*

All this is plain. Therefore it is equally plain that those members of the church that submitted to Diotrephes in the course which he took, did wrong and committed themselves to the wrong thing. And in addition to this, by so doing—they put their endorsement upon the course of Diotrephes as the right thing and thus encouraged and supported him in that wrong course.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.13*

The issue that was there made by Diotrephes was the straight and plain issue of whether the brethren of the church should be loyal to Christ or loyal to Diotrephes. It was the straight and plain issue that for any member of that Church to be loyal to Christ was to be openly disloyal to Diotrephes; and to be loyal to Diotrephes was to be openly disloyal to Christ. And further the issue was so clear that even to submit to Diotrephes, not out of chosen loyalty, but only from policy, this itself was disloyalty to Christ.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.14*

But those who were loyal to Christ were by Diotrephes cast out of the church. Yet since these were loyal to Christ, when they were cast out of the church that was dominated by Diotrephes they were not by any means nor in any sense out of the Church of Christ—they were only out of the Church of Diotrephes. And to be out of that church was a good deal better than to be in it. And those who were out of it were a good deal better off than were those who were in it. Since by Diotrephes's procedure that church could be composed only of those who were submissive to him, for all others must be cast out; and since his whole position and course was anti-christian, then that church was plainly a church of anti-christ instead of a church of Christ, and the only true place for Christians was outside of it. And indeed, Christians could not be in it for he cast them out.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.15*

By the fact that some submitted to Diotrephes while others would not, it is perfectly plain that there was division in that church. But who made the division? Beyond question a breach was made in the church. But who was responsible for that breach? Can it be laid to the charge of those who were in the right, who did the right thing, and who were loyal to Christ?*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.16*

NO: the division, the breach,—the whole difficulty from beginning to end—was caused wholly by Diotrephes himself. He had assumed—usurped—position and authority that in no wise belonged to him, but only to Christ. Then in that position he chose to pursue a course that was the opposite of all the whole Spirit, and Word, and way, of Christ. Then when some would not consent nor submit to this, he would not permit any such thing as any right of dissent from his will and dictation; he would not recognize any such thing as the

relationship and allegiance of the individual person to *Christ direct*; he would not allow any right of individual conscience and choice; all of which belongs by divine right forever to every Christian everywhere; yet none of this whatever would Diotrephes allow—he cast them out of the Church.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.17*

Diotrephes, therefore, and Diotrephes alone, was wholly responsible for the division and breach that was in that church. He made the division, he made the breach, himself alone.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 170.18*

No Christian can ever be rightly charged with any responsibility for any division, or breach, or difficulty of any kind whatever, that arises because of his being a Christian, or because of his acting on Christian principle, or because of his standing loyal to Christ above all.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 171.1*

Ah! and just here there was raised that subtle and arrogant—that Diotrephesian—question: Who shall decide just when and whether the individual church member is acting really on Christian principle, and is in reality standing loyal to Christ? Might he not mistake just what is Christian principle? and just what is loyalty to Christ? Therefore, should not he allow in favor of Diotrephes, *the official*, the weight of authority, safety, and certainty? *MEDM May 29, 1907, page 171.2*

But the official himself is only an individual; and that would be nothing else than one individual;—Diotrephes, deciding for another individual—the private church member. It would also be nothing else than one individual's *consenting* that another individual should decide for him. And *that* would be nothing else than the one individual's surrendering to the other individual, his own individuality, so that that other individual would then be deciding for both *himself* and *the other*. But what guaranty would there be that Diotrephes could decide for himself *and* the other man, any more safely or certainly than the other man could decide for *himself*. Any such guaranty could be only because of his being an *official* and occupying a *position*. The guaranty, then, would attach *not* to the individual—Diotrephes—but to the *office*, to the *position*, to the *chair*! And there you have the whole principle of papal infallibility in

an instant.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 171.3*

Again: the official is himself only an individual. And if the individual *church-member* is not capable of deciding for himself, then is not the individual *official* equally incapable of deciding for *himself*—even as an official? If the individual church-member must have the individual official to decide for him, then who shall decide for the individual official? Must there not be some higher and more official official to decide for this one? and so on back——how far? Yet somewhere in that course you must come at last to the *farthest one back*: to the highest possible and most official of *all officials*, who decides for *himself* and the other man. But wherever this limit shall be set, and this final official found, when he *is* found, he is found to be nothing else than simply an individual, and an individual *deciding for himself*.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 171.4*

Thus in this Diotrephesian course, there is no escape from finally an *individual* who decides for *himself*. And with this, there is no escape from the danger and possibility of that individual's mistaking just what is Christian principle and exactly what is loyalty to Christ. But that is only where you started. And there stands the original question, How can there be any more safety and certainty in one individual's deciding for *himself* and *the other man too*, than in the other man's deciding for himself; especially when the *one* has to decide for himself anyhow? And when you land *at last* where the individual of your own choosing does *decide for himself*, why not accept the truth and principle of the thing, and land there *at first*, and recognize freely before God, and as from God, the divine right of individuality and of conscience everywhere and always?*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 171.5*

But it may be asked, Does it not equally involve the claim of infallibility—the infallibility of the private individual, when the private individual claims the right and the capability of deciding for himself in disregard of the will and command of Diotrephes?—Not at all. Because the private individual is not depending upon any figment of office or position, nor is he even depending upon *himself*, to decide it; *but upon the Holy Spirit* and the promise of Christ that the Spirit *will guide him* into all truth. And the infallibility is in *the Holy Spirit* where it justly and only belongs.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 171.6*

Still the query may be raised, Might he not mistake even the way of the Spirit? Yes, even that is possible. But still *beyond that* he has ever the sure promise of Christ that the Holy Spirit “*Will* guide you into all truth.” That is to say, the Holy Spirit is able to guide a man even out of his mistakes as to the guidance of the Spirit. And *He will do this* for every one who trusts him; for He is divine, and there alone is infallibility. And the divine Spirit of promise is infinitely more capable of showing to a man his mistake, and of guiding him out of it, than ten thousand Diotrepheses could possibly be.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 171.7*

It comes, then, simply to this, that the Holy Spirit is the sole source of appeal and of judgment among Christians. And whosoever among Christians takes upon him to judge or to decide for another, usurps the place of the Holy Spirit, and asserts for himself the divine prerogative of infallibility.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 171.8*

Therefore, in all matters of difference between individual Christians, even though it be between a “preeminent” official and a private member of the church, there must be recognized the right of individuality and of conscience before God; each and all must, in the fear and honor of God, bow to that right of individuality and conscience; and in brotherly love and mutual forbearance, each commit the other and the whole matter *to the Holy Spirit*, trusting His infallible guidance, judgment, and decision. Thus there will ever be maintained, “the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace;” for “*He will guide you into all truth.*”*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 171.9*

All this will always be perfectly plain and easy to every Christian, to every one who will honor the Holy Spirit in the place that is His in the Church. But to Diotrephes, *never*: Diotrephes must have “the preeminence;” Diotrephes must go beyond his office; Diotrephes must usurp authority; Diotrephes must ascend the throne; Diotrephes must take the seat of judgment and decision; Diotrephes must pronounce the decree; and to all this all must bown or be cast out of the church.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 171.10*

And there is no middle ground. Everywhere, always, and with all in the church, it is the Holy Spirit or Diotrephes; in other words, Christianity or the Papacy.*MEDM May 29, 1907, page 171.11*

June 12, 1907

“The Baptists and Church Federation” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 24, p. 187.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

AND this indicates the difference in other points. In the Christian order, Christian work is done by individual Christians; each one of whom is led to the work and fitted for it by the Holy Spirit. in the federation system the work is done by those who are called and sent and managed and controlled by a sheer officialdom, through executive boards, the members of the officialdom connected with “missionary” work solely because they occupy an official position, and they hold official position more because of manipulation of ecclesiastical politic and machinery than from any missionary spirit or zeal.*MEDM June 12, 1907, page 187.1*

In the discussion of this Report in the Baptist Ministers’ Conference, it was well said that “Not every ‘merger’ is beneficial to its promoters or its stockholders. The forced organic union of our three societies into one mammoth organization would, in our view, be immediately disastrous. The interests they represent are too vast, too diversified, too complex to allow it.”*MEDM June 12, 1907, page 187.2*

In this connection also, in the discussion, the question was asked, “How are we going to bring this [already existing missionary] Northern Baptist Convention, unless its members wish to come?” Upon Christian ground and with respect to the individuality and conscience of Christians, that would be a very proper inquiry. But in the presence of “federation” and “confederation” the question is merely academic rather than practical. For as to the point itself the “leadership” of the “strong federation” can very easily make that matter all plain; this leadership can simply issue its commands to the Society that it “come under” the administration of the “strong confederation.” And if the Society choose not to do this, then the leadership of the “strong confederation,” conscious of its power, can totally ignore the Society and “organize” a new Society adapted to

the confederation; and then, by all the power and influence of the “strong confederation” systematically undermine the original society, destroy its credit and its work, and crush it out of all efficiency, if not actually out of existence.*MEDM June 12, 1907, page 187.3*

Further, upon the supposition that the society should decide to accept the merger with the “strong confederation,” in the discussion it was remarked: “If they vote to take that action, no bare majority vote will be effective—a merger on the basis of a bare majority vote would be a fatal blow to our whole foreign missionary work.”*MEDM June 12, 1907, page 187.4*

Upon Christian principles such alternative as that might be counted worthy of consideration; but as against the successful administration of a “strong confederation,” any such result would be held as of very minor importance. For, with the policy of a “strong confederation” firmly fixed, the success of that policy would take precedence of all other questions or considerations of every kind; and the leadership of that “strong confederation” would push recklessly forward, making it more and more manifest that whosoever would not come under must get out, and that, whether a society or an individual person, whosoever would not conform to the policy of the administration of the “strong confederation” and thus be recognized as *of the confederation*, would be counted as no longer of the Baptist *denomination* and not entitled even to the name of Baptist.*MEDM June 12, 1907, page 187.5*

Of course this procedure would roughly sweep aside considerations of Christian unity; and would supplant it with a machine unity, a confederation unity, a unity of human domination. Also, of course, such procedure would cause division and a breach in the Baptist ranks; because in the nature of the case all who would be Christians in loyalty *to Christ* in his place as head of the church, would refuse to come under such domination.*MEDM June 12, 1907, page 187.6*

But, it may be said, such a thing as that would not be Christian. True enough; but it would be “a strong confederation.” The wrecking of any efficient missionary society and the ruthless spreading of

confusion and suspicion amongst the Baptist churches throughout the world would be a very small matter as compared to the triumph of the “strong confederation.” The “wreckage strewn along the way” would be considered by the “leadership” of the “strong confederation” as only the greater evidence of the essential value and efficiency of the “strong confederation.” And this is all sufficient to demonstrate just what lies in scripture and on the face of the thing itself, that federation and confederation is simply anti-Christian.*MEDM June 12, 1907, page 187.7*

(To be continued.)

June 19, 1907

“The Baptists and Church Federation” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 25, pp. 195, 196.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

(Concluded).

AS already indicated this report and movement for federation and confederation is not finding altogether smooth sailing in the meeting of the Baptist ministers of Boston and vicinity. Opposition to it is strong, and it is able. And it is the stronger and the more able, because it is scriptural, and plants itself firmly upon the scripture ground. Illustration of this is found in the words and citations of a paper in opposition to it that was read before the Boston Baptist Ministers' Conference, April 22, 1907, by Prof. George E. Horr, D. D., as follows:—*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 195.1*

“Baptists have in general strenuously contended that the single Christian congregation has no earthly ecclesiastical organization above it. They have recognized the right, the privilege, and the duty, of cooperation among these several independent churches. But they have no right, and would regard it as no privilege, to come together, and by their cooperation. Form the Baptist Church of the United States; or the British Baptist Church, in case the independent churches of our views in Great Britain should so combine. Baptists have protested loudly and sternly, and contended even to the death, against the right of any council or association, meeting in the name of the churches, to lord it over their discipline or doctrine.*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 195.2*

“Is there, then, no cooperation possible among them? Much and most effective cooperation, we answer, long as Christ and the Holy Spirit inhabit these several churches, and by such inhabitation give them the necessary unity and mutual love. Without that Spirit they are, and it is safer that they should remain, a rope of sand. But when pervaded by that divine and assimilating love, the sand is

molten into a sea of glass. Their cohesion depends upon their piety.*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 195.3*

“The perpetual immanence and intercession of the Holy Ghost in the hearts and assemblies of a devout church—this is the breath of our nostrils as to our Spiritual life and well-being, and this is the patent of our indefectibility and invincibility. Soon as the Spirit is grieved and goes forth our polity is such that the process of ecclesiastical disintegration at once commences. When the breath or earthly spirit goes out of a man, his body rots, and the members fall apart. When the fruit becomes decayed, its skin no longer holds the pulp, but it loses shape and solidity and cohesion. So it is with the polity of the New Testament churches. As long as they remain spiritual and prayerful, our churches with Christ in their hearts and Christ in their assemblies, have, on our system, energy, and elasticity, and boundless enterprise, and yet perfect union. But when piety dies, the unity and power disappear, as they ought of right to do; for unity without piety makes the church a curse to the world. Other systems hold the ecclesiastical continuity and organization unbroken, when the Spirit and inward life has vanished. They galvanize the corpse of a Christian church into ghastly and murderous activity, after the breath of the divine life has quitted it....*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 195.4*

“Our churches cannot *give* legislative power, because they have it not; and councils or voluntary societies have therefore no right to *take* legislative power as a gift from the churches, even should the churches assume to make such a gift. But forgetting that the legislation of the church was settled and closed centuries since, looking at the democratic side of the church organization in the voluntary character of its membership, and overlooking the regal side of that organization in the sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ; then, on this false assumption that the church is, merely and purely, a democracy, building the inference, that, like any other democracy, it should make and mend its own laws; on these false premises building still another false assumption, that the several independent democracies of the various separate churches may come together, by their representatives, and make one conjoint democratic confederacy, which shall legislate for its constituent churches, and yet another false assumption, that the messenger or delegate of the

primitive churches was what we call a representative, sent to similar confederacies—thus, we say, heaping baseless assumptions one on another, good men, loving freedom and Scripture, build up a system which is neither friendly to Scriptural truth nor practical freedom.*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 195.5*

“When the system of literal and proper representation was introduced into the early Christian churches, it began with those of Greece, and was a reminiscence of their old republics and Amphictyonic Councils. In the early and middle ages of the Roman pontiffs, these representative bodies, the church synods, favored political liberty, against the despotism of emperors, and against a stern and bloody feudalism. But they, from an early period subverted *religious* liberty, by consolidating ecclesiastical power. A central despotism thus sprung up, before which the haughtiest of earthly monarchs grew pale, in the core of which sate [*sic.*] Antichrist fully formed, and over the throne of whose guilty and impious arrogance the Apocalypse has rolled its heaviest thunders and is pouring out vials of wrath not yet emptied to their last dregs. Representation, in the popular sense, however necessary in the *State* to political liberty, is in the *Christian Church* unwarranted and anti-Christian; because it legislates itself into Christ’s seat, and revises his statute-book, and enslaves his freemen.”*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 195.6*

Therefore “we have no right to admit the dangerous principle of church representation. If representation does not necessarily result in legislation, it slopes toward it as the ways of a ship soon to be launched.” ...*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 195.7*

“Now if our churches, in claiming the representative principle, mean what their words mean, and we fear that many from heedlessness do mean just this, they have already passed the Rubicon, and their fancied democracy has taken the first and decisive step in the way to Rome. It wants but time and development and the heart’s treachery and Satan’s vigilant activity, to bring in all the rest—the crosier, the canon, the tiara, and the pontiff—infallibility, and despotism and anti-Christ.”*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 195.8*

“The further you go in this matter, the more thoroughly you will be

convinced that the reluctance of Baptists to form ‘a representative delegated body’ is deep and inveterate. The spirit that found consummate expression in the eloquent report of Dr. William R. Williams in 1848 is alive in the denomination. Thousands of Baptists do not join in the cry “Make us a king like all the nations.’ They believe that even a Saul and a David may be a mistake.*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 196.1*

“This conviction strikes deep into the past. It manifests itself unmistakably in our historic confessions. It has been normative in our genius and spirit as Baptists....*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 196.2*

“Let me close this address by quoting a sentence from the report of 1848 to which I have referred:—*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 196.3*

“‘The vital missionary agency is happily beyond our control and above our reach. The helm is not given to our weak and mortal hands. The Pilot who points the prow and watches the heavens to guide our missionary way, is older than the stars, and than the keel of the missionary church that He guides; for He is the Ancient of Days, and His goings forth have been from everlasting.’”*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 196.4*

Now who can say, yea, who can have the mind or heart to say, that this opposition of the Baptists to federation and confederation among themselves is not perfectly right and soundly Christian? Yet, whatever any person may or might choose to say or to think of it, it still stands, and will forever stand, as eternally right and perfectly Christian.*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 196.5*

But this movement for “federation” and “strong confederation” among the Baptists is only a part of the general, and soon to be universal, movement for national, international, and world federation and “strong confederation.” It well illustrates just what church federation and confederation means. Indeed, this is proposed to the Baptists, primarily that, as a *denomination*, they may be fitted to become a part of the great general movement to swing the world into federation and under the “leadership” of “a strong confederation.” Therefore, the opposition of Baptists to federation and confederation *among themselves*, is in principle and in

substance the sound Christian example of what must be the opposition to federation and confederation everywhere.*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 196.6*

It may indeed be all true that, as the first paragraph of the revised report says, the “failure to attain the highest denominational effectiveness” makes manifest the need of something definite “to secure it.” But it is eternally certain that no “policy” of any kind whatever, can ever secure it. The only possible means by which at any time any lack of denominational effectiveness among the Baptists, or anywhere else, can ever be remedied is by the *principle*—never “policy”—of seeking most devotedly for the baptism of the Holy Spirit. And now when the “failure to attain the highest denominational effectiveness” is so universal, and there is such a universal attempt to remedy the failure by resort to the definite and pernicious “policy” of federation and “strong confederation,” *just now*, as never before, it is imperative that this failure shall be sought to be remedied only by nothing else than a very Pentecostal receiving of the Holy Spirit.*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 196.7*

Therefore, just now and henceforth the living issue with every Baptist, and not only every Baptist, but also every Christian, is, whether he will seek the Holy Spirit or federation. And not only with every Christian, but with every *soul*, just now and henceforth the living issue is whether he will receive the Holy Spirit, or the spirit of federation; whether he will recognize the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit, or the sovereignty of a “strong confederation”; whether he will have the liberty of the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit, or the slavery of the domination of the “leadership” of “a strong confederation.”*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 196.8*

And there is no middle ground. For federation and confederation is sweeping the world like a flood; and it will *force itself upon* the decision of every soul. And now that this enemy is coming in like a flood to carry away the world to destruction—*just now* the Spirit of the Lord lifts up the standard against him, to lead to eternal salvation every soul who will receive Him and be led by Him.*MEDM June 19, 1907, page 196.9*

To receive federation means only man's domination, and this by force. To receive the Holy Spirit means only God's sovereignty, and this by love, and *in* this the *liberty* of love, and the love of *liberty*. *MEDM June 19, 1907, page 196.10*

June 26, 1907

“The Catholic Church” The Medical Missionary, 16, 26, pp. 204, 205.

ATJ

BY ALONZO T. JONES

THE word “Catholic” signifies “general, universal;” literally, “according to the whole.” In the common or King James version of the Scriptures, the epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude are entitled “The *General* Epistle of James,” “The First Epistle *General* of Peter” or of John, “The *General* Epistle of Jude.” In some versions these titles read, “The *Catholic* Epistle of James,” “The First Epistle *Catholic* of Peter,” or of John, “The *Catholic* Epistle of Jude.” *MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.1*

In the New Testament and in the divine order of the Christian church, each separate congregation of Christians is designated as a church—the “church at Antioch,” “the church which is at Cenchrea,” etc. *MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.2*

When these separate congregations are referred to collectively, it is in the terms, “the churches of the Gentiles,” “the churches of Galatia,” “churches of the saints,” “the Spirit saith unto the churches,” etc. *MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.3*

When all Christians universally are referred to, it is in the terms “the Church of Christ,” “the Church of God,” “the Church which is His body,” “gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church.” This is the Church “*according to the whole*,” the “*general, universal*” Church, and therefore the *catholic* Church. This is the true *catholic* Church. It is this catholic Church, this Church “according to the whole,” that is referred to in the words of the “Apostles’ Creed”—“I believe in the holy catholic Church.” Every Christian does believe in this general, this universal, this *catholic*, Church; this Church “according to the whole.” *MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.4*

In the earliest times of Christianity, this true meaning of the word “catholic” was everywhere recognized, and the catholic Church was

in truth held to be only the whole body of Christians in the world. And this continued so long as all Christians remained only *brethren* and therefore *equal*, and *all one* in Christ Jesus, with Christ himself the only Master and superior. But just as soon as self-exaltation and exclusiveness entered in, all of this beautiful sense and application of the word “catholic” was thrown away. The whole original thought of the word was perverted, and it was made to apply in only a narrow and exclusive sense to a sect or self-exalted division that *called itself* “the Church.” *MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.5*

In the churches, there were elders and deacons. These were at first, and in the Christian Church are always, chosen as the *servants* of the churches; not their lords nor their masters. “Those who are regarded as rulers of the heathen, as you know, lord it over them, and their great men are their masters. But among you it *must not be* so. On the contrary, whosoever wishes to become great among you, must be your *servant*, and whoever wishes to take a first place among you must be at *the call of every one*; for even the Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many.” *Mark 10:42-45; Matthew 20:25-27*, 20th Century Version. *MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.6*

Only condemnation attaches to any kind of mastership, except only that of Christ. “Be not many masters, knowing that ye shall receive the greater condemnation.” Since *many* masters mean only the *greater* condemnation, then any masters at all means only condemnation. Therefore, “Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in Heaven. Neither be ye called masters, for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant.” *MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.7*

In the Scriptures the terms “elder” and “bishop” invariably designate the same person in the church. The word “elder” signifies primarily an older person; while “bishop” signifies an “overseer,” a “lookout.” And these are distinctly instructed that, while they are over-seers, they are not to think that they are over-lords or over-rulers. *Acts 20:28; 1 Peter 5:1-3*, with margin. *MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.8*

Yet, very soon, there were of the elders those of whom Diotrephes is the illustration, who loved to have “the preeminence among them.” These asserted a distinction between bishops and elders or presbyters; and claimed for themselves *only*, the title of “*bishop*,” as the “*superior*,” while the others, as inferior, were entitled only to the designation of presbyter. And the presbyters were, of course, “superior” to the deacons.*MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.9*

The bishops then assumed over the presbyters a superiority and an authority that never belonged to them. The presbyters, in turn, assumed over the deacons superiority and authority that never belonged to them. And all three of these “orders” together—bishops presbyters, and deacons—assumed a superiority and exercised an authority that never belonged to them, over *the people*; and asserted for themselves the distinction of “the clergy,” while the general membership of the church were only “the *laity*.” As a matter of course for this no justification could be found in the Christian order. Therefore, recourse was had to the Mosaic order. Then these three “orders” of the “clergy” also claimed that they in the Christian Church were the legitimate successors of the high priest, the priests and the Levites of the Levitical law. With this also there was indulged a splendor of dress and function analogous to that of the sanctuary service under Levitical law, while the air of superiority and the exercise of authority that was indulged was always in the spirit of a *Roman magistrate*, instead of that of the Christian *ministry*.*MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.10*

From this point it was an easy step to the arrogance that demanded that “we should look upon the bishop even as we would upon the Lord himself;” and that asserted that “the Church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the church is controlled by these same rulers.” And further, “Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the Church and the church in the bishop; and if any one is *not with the bishop*, that he is *not in the church*.”*MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.11*

Thus by these bishops and their “clergy” there was built up an hierarchical system which *they* called “the Church.” To this thing they confined the term “catholic” and then insisted that *this* was the catholic Church, and denied to all others any right even to the *name*

of Christian, and much more of *Catholic* Christians.*MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.12*

Also, as Diotrephes at the first, these over-lords, in their overbearing despotism, issued commands and made demands that were not only unchristian, but anti-christian; commands which no Christian could obey, and demands to which no Christian could conform—and remain a Christian. All such disobedience was denounced as heresy and schism, and these Christians were cast out of the church.*MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.13*

However, it is worthy of note that the overlording ones were compelled to acknowledge that those Christians were not cast out because of any disrespect or disobedience *to Christ* or to His word, but only to the usurping and overbearing bishopric. They publicly declared, and it has stood for all time, that “Neither have heresies arisen, nor have schisms originated, *from any other source than this*, that God’s priest is *not obeyed*: ... whom if ... the whole fraternity *should obey* ... *no one would rend the Church* by a *division* of the unity of Christ.”*MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.14*

The “unity” of this man-made and heathen system called “the church,” was thus made to be of more importance than either truth or righteousness, or than even Christian character. No room was now allowed for any question as to *what* any one taught, or what was his Christian character, “so long as he teaches out of the pale of unity.” In this way the very truth of Christ was made to be heresy; and the truest Christians were made to be heretics and schismatics in order to maintain a factitious, outward, and enforced “unity.”*MEDM June 26, 1907, page 204.15*

Then, as they had made the “unity” of this anti-Christian thing to be of more importance than truth or righteousness or Christian character, and when this “unity” had become perfected, it followed naturally enough that truth and righteousness and Christian character should all be made to spring from, and to be the consequence of, this “unity.” And so the ultimatum was announced —*MEDM June 26, 1907, page 206.1*

(*To be Concluded.*)

July 3, 1907

“The Catholic Church” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 27, pp. 211, 212.

ATJ

BY ALONZO T. JONES

(Concluded)

AND so the ultimatum was announced—*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 211.1*

“It is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the Church—those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles; those who, *together with the succession of the episcopate*, have received the *certain gift of truth* according to the good pleasure of the father.” “Since, however, it would be very tedious in such a volume as this to reckon up the successions of all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vain glory, or by blindness, or perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings: (We do this, I say) by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, and universally known church founded and *organized at Rome* by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of *the succession of the bishops*. For it is a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this church, on account of its *preeminent authority*.... Since, therefore, we have such proofs, it is *not necessary* to seek the truth among others which it is easy to obtain from the church; since the apostles, like a rich man depositing his money in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously *all things* pertaining to *the truth*, so that every man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of life. For *she* is the *entrance to life*; all others are thieves and robbers.”*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 211.2*

And since nothing could be recognized or accepted as the truth except as it came from Rome, it next followed that *whatever came from Rome was truth* in itself, and *must be accepted* as the truth

without any kind of question. Also no one could be righteous except in the garb of Rome. And whether or not any one's character was Christian was made to depend upon *Rome's* recognition and recommendation.*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 211.3*

There was thus built up a narrow, partisan, and exclusive system to which was arrogated the idea and the title of the Church "according to the whole," and therefore, "the catholic Church" and "the body of Christ." Then when, in the progress of this federate and confederate episcopal system, the development had spread over the Roman world and had culminated in one bishop at the great center, as the recognized as well as the asserted head of this body, he naturally enough was head of "the catholic Church," head of the "body of Christ," and therefore "vicar of Christ" or "viceregent of the Son of God," the fountain of faith and of the truth, and therefore infallible.*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 211.4*

Thus in the place of the *true* Church "according to the whole," in place of the true Church of Christ which is his body, in place of that divine and spiritual Church which is composed of all true Christians who are known to Christ as his, and which is the fulness of him that filleth all in all, and whose unity is the unity of the Holy Spirit—in the place of this true, and truly holy, catholic Church, there was set up an arrogant, hierarchical and anti-christian *machine*, despotic to all who were in it, and persecuting to all who would not be of it; "organized" and conducted only by men; and refusing the name of Christian to all who were not of the machine. And this counterfeit, this fraud, this narrow sectarian thing, they crowded upon the world, and passed it off as the true catholic Church, the true church "according to the whole."*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 211.5*

Then when, at the close of the Diocletian persecution, and under an imperial edict applying to "the whole body of Christians" alike, without distinction, this centralized system would gain possession of all the church property in the Roman empire, the project was made successful by the gaining of *imperial recognition* for this narrow, partisan, and exclusive sect or division, as the catholic church.*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 211.6*

As stated, the imperial edict was made in behalf of "the whole body

of Christians” alike, without distinction; and the edict directed that the church property that had been confiscated should “be restored to *these same* Christians.” But this narrow, partisan, and bogus “catholic Church” launched the claim that all who were out of the pale of *her* “unity” were not Christians, were not entitled to the name of Christian, and therefore could not be beneficiaries under the edict.*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 211.7*

When the question came to the emperor—Constantine—for decision, he sustained the contention, and in a new edict declared that “those things belonging to the *catholic church* of the Christians ... *these* thou shalt cause immediately to be restored to *their* churches ... since we have previously determined that whatsoever *these same churches* before possessed, shall be restored to their right.”*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 211.8*

Presently Constantine carried this a step further, in an edict, in these words: “I show such regard for *the holy catholic church* that I wish you, upon the whole, to leave no room for schism or division.”*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 211.9*

There was one more step to be taken to raise this thing to the pinnacle. This step was taken, also by Constantine, in an edict in which he used the following words: “We have determined that in all the provinces of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania, something should be granted to certain ministers of *the legitimate and most* holy catholic religion to defray their expenses.... And as I ascertained that some men, who are of no settled mind, wished to divert the people from the *most holy catholic Church* by a certain pernicious adulteration, I wish thee to understand that I have given both to the proconsul Anulinus and to Patricius, vicar-general of the prefects the following injunctions: That, among all the rest, they should *particularly* pay the *necessary attention* to this, nor should by *any means tolerate* that this should be overlooked.”*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 211.10*

And that, in brief, is the story of how arose “the Catholic Church” of history; that awful thing that has made the blackest record that has ever been made in all the history of this world. And the whole philosophy of that darkest record lies simply in the fact that a

human system of government, wholly of the natural world, was adopted as the order of things for the Church and in the spiritual world. The papacy was not the worst thing in the world because the men who composed it were the worst men in the world; for they were always only the same sort of men as were everywhere in the world. The papacy was always the worst thing in the world only because the same natural men as of the world everywhere, carried their natural dispositions and natural ways, and the ways and things of *this world*, into the realm of the spirit, and would make all these to be the things of the spiritual world.*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 211.11*

Every form of government ever of this world tends only to monarchy and despotism, because the dispositions of men who are only of this world are essentially monarchical and despotic. Carrying the dispositions and the things of this world into the spiritual world and making these things to be the things of the spiritual world, does not change these dispositions or these things; it only intensifies the evil effects of the things themselves that are already essentially evil. This is why it is that the papacy, being composed only of human beings like all others of this world, yet proves worse than all other in the world. And every system of church order that partakes in any way of any of these elements will be in the *likeness of the papacy*, just so far as it goes in that direction.*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 212.1*

Natural things for the natural world only, and spiritual things only for the spiritual world. This is the law of eternal consistency.*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 212.2*

The Christian church is spiritual. It is the body of Christ, and that body is wholly spiritual. The realm of the Christian Church is only that of spirit—the Spirit of God, and the spirit of man. Whosoever is of this Church is so only because of his having been born of the Spirit. The law of this church is only “the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus” as in the Word of the Lord which is spirit and which is life. The administration of this church is only the administration of the Lord who is Spirit. The kingdom to which alone that Church belongs is only the kingdom of God, and is spiritual. And only those who are spiritual can possibly know this Church which is of *this* kingdom. For “the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit

of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” And “except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” Yea, more. “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.” This alone is the true catholic Church.*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 212.3*

Therefore, the true catholic Church is, still, and is forever, just what it was in New Testament times. It is the Christian Church “according to the whole.” It is composed of those anywhere and everywhere who belong to Christ in deed and in truth, by personal choice and personal faith; for “in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him.” It is the “church of the first born which are written in heaven.” It is the Church which is His body. It is the Church, every member of which is a member of Christ himself. It is the Church of which Christ alone is the head, the builder, the organizer, and of which his own Spirit is the life and the power, the Sovereign, and the Guide. This alone is the true catholic Church, the true Church “according to the whole.”*MEDM July 3, 1907, page 212.4*

July 24, 1907

“Authority of the Church?” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 30, pp. 235, 236.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

THE great historian of the Reformation, writing of the famous *protest* from which comes the word Protestant—the protest of the Reformers that was made at Spires—says:—*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 235.1*

“This protest opposes two abuses of man in matters of faith: the *first* is the intrusion of the civil magistrate; and the *second*, the arbitrary authority of the Church. Instead of these abuses, Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate; and the authority of the Word of God above the visible Church.”*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 235.2*

The first abuse in matters of faith, here mentioned—“the intrusion of the civil magistrate”—has been thoroughly discussed through all the subsequent times, so that the principle involved is generally well understood.*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 235.3*

But the second abuse here mentioned—“the arbitrary authority of the Church”—has not been nearly so much discussed, is not nearly so well understood, and is far less recognized.*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 235.4*

The reason for this difference in the discussion and the understanding of these two abuses is that, whereas all denominations, in turn and together, have always been ready to discuss and oppose the first of these abuses, no *denomination*, as such, has ever been willing to discuss the second abuse; because each denomination in turn, and all together, has always been ready to exercise and enjoy this very abuse. Therefore the discussion of this has always fallen to individual persons, who, in the very doing of it, were distinguished and denounced as “heretics, schismatics,” etc., etc. Then when the “heresy” had proved successful and had

gained a standing—in short, had developed a denomination—it in turn fell into the same old train, and asserted and exercised arbitrary authority, instead of any longer discussing and disputing it.*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 235.5*

It is therefore perfectly proper, and always timely, to discuss this great abuse in matters of faith,—the arbitrary authority of the Church; for no greater nor more lasting abuse has ever been inflicted upon the world.*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 235.6*

In order to study this intelligently, let us first understand the terms:—*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 235.7*

The word “authority” is defined as “the right to command and to enforce obedience; the right to act by virtue of office, station, or relation.”*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 235.8*

The word “arbitrary” means “not regulated by fixed rule or law; subject to individual will or judgment; exercised according to one’s will or caprice.”*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 235.9*

The synonyms of the word “arbitrary” are: “Capricious, unlimited, irresponsible, uncontrolled, tyrannical, domineering, imperious, despotic, absolute in power.”*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 235.10*

First as to authority itself: What “authority,” what “right to command and enforce obedience,” has the Church? Is the series of God’s commands left unfinished in his word, and has the Church “authority” to complete it? Is God’s revelation as in his Word incomplete, and has the Church “authority” to perfect it? (*Revelation 22:18, 19.*) In short, Is Christianity a religion of the Word of God, the Bible, only? Or is it a religion of the Bible *and tradition*? Is it of Christ alone or is it of Christ *and the Church*? That is to say, Is it of Christ or is it of the papacy?*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 246.1*

All of this is clearly and abundantly answered in the Scriptures. And in the answer the first item is that by the Lord Jesus himself the Church is positively forbidden any exercise of authority. Here are the words: “Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercised dominion over them, and they that are great *exercise authority* upon them. *But it shall not be so among you.*” *Matthew 20:25, 26.**MEDM*

July 24, 1907, page 246.2

Now when “authority” is “the right to command,” and when the Church is thus by Christ positively forbidden any exercise of authority, then it stands fixed plainly by the Word of God that the Church is forbidden by Christ all exercise of any right to command or to act by virtue of office, station, or relation.*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 246.3*

The reason for this is equally plain: “It shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant; even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.” *Matthew 20:26-28.MEDM July 24, 1907, page 246.4*

The Church is not in the world to *rule*, but to *minister*: not to *command* but to *serve*: even as her divine Lord came into the world not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and this to the extent of giving his very life that men might be ransomed from the thralldom of sin.*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 246.5*

It is not in the province of the Church to exercise authority “by virtue of any office, station, or relation;” because the office, station and relation of the Church is only that of servant.*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 246.6*

It is never in the province of a servant to reign—so long as he is in the place and position of a servant. And the place and position of servant is exactly that of the children of God and disciples of Christ—who compose the Church—so long as they are in this world. Free, and freely chosen, service, loving service, it is true; but none the less it is *service*: “Ye have been called unto liberty, only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh: but by love *serve* one another.” “Through love *be servants* one to another.” R.V. *Galatians 5:13.MEDM July 24, 1907, page 246.7*

It is not only utterly incongruous therefore, but actually mischievous, for a servant to assume to rule, to command,—to exercise authority. For of the “three things” on account of which “the earth is disquieted,” and of the “four which *it can not bear*,” the very *first* is

“a servant when he reigneth.” (*Proverbs 30:21, 22*). And hasn’t the history of the Church from Diotrephes to this day, demonstrated this divine truth in most wearisome detail? For in all the history of the world what has more disquieted the earth, and what has been harder for it to bear, than the reign of the church, wherever and just to the extent that her reign has been asserted?*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 246.8*

Again, under the Word of God, there is no “fixed rule or law” for the exercise of authority either in or by the Church, nor is there any room for her to act by virtue of office, station, or relation, because in the Church of Christ *all are equal*; there are no masters, nor is there place for any. “Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.... Neither be ye called Masters; for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.” (*Matthew 23:8-12*). Therefore, “who art thou that judgest another man’s servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth.” *Romans 14:4.**MEDM July 24, 1907, page 246.9*

In the presence and under the Word of Christ, the one Commander, what authority has one Christian to command, or to legislate for, another? Absolutely none whatever. And when no one Christian has any authority whatever to command, or to legislate, for another, then what possible authority can any *number* of these have to command or legislate for another?*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 246.10*

Of Christ it is written, “Behold I have given Him for a witness to the people, a Leader and Commander to the people.” (*Isaiah 55:4*). Christ is “the Head of the Church, which is his body.” In *the head*, not in the the [*sic.*] body, is the place of intelligence, judgment, and will. It is in *the Head*, not in the body, which is the Church, where is the seat of authority, and it is the Head, not the body, who issues commands in the things of religion.*MEDM July 24, 1907, page 246.11*

Again, Christ is “the mighty God,” the supreme king and the sole sovereign, in and to the Church, and in and over “all things to the

Church.” On the other hand “the Church *is subject* unto Christ ... in all things.” (*Ephesians 5:24*). The Church, then, is subject, not *sovereign*. It is hers to *obey*, not to *command*: to obey *Christ*, not to command *men*. *MEDM July 24, 1907, page 246.12*

By the plain word of Christ, then, as well as by the situation and relation of the Church itself, the Church is specifically forbidden to exercise authority,—forbidden to exercise any right to command. It therefore follows that any exercise of dominion, or of authority, by the Church, upon or over anybody, is in itself “*arbitrary* authority.” For, as we have seen, “arbitrary” is “not regulated by fixed rule or law; subject to individual will or judgment.” And when there is not only neither fixed rule nor law regulating the exercise of authority by the Church, but there is the positive prohibition of it, then any exercise of authority by the church is absolutely without any fixed rule or law from the Lord, and therefore can be only the assertion of authority by the will or caprice or at the instance of some individual or collection of individuals, and so is arbitrary only. *MEDM July 24, 1907, page 246.13*

July 31, 1907

“Authority of the Church” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 31, pp. 243, 244.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

LAST week we discussed the question of authority of the church. *MEDM July 31, 1907, page 243.1*

While there is no such thing as any authority of any church, there is authority *in* the Church of Christ. This authority is in Christ's Church because he, by his divine Spirit, is in his Church. The authority *in* the Church, therefore, is the authority of the living God, in the living Christ, by the living Spirit, through the living Word of Truth. *MEDM July 31, 1907, page 243.2*

“All authority is given unto Me in Heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations.... And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” “In Whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through *the Spirit*.” Thus, and thus only, is there any authority even *in* the Church. And this authority *in* the Church, never, in any way, becomes the authority of the Church; but is always the authority solely of Him who is the Head and Life of the Church, who dwells in the Church by His divine Spirit, and to whom alone is given all authority in heaven and earth. It is He alone who exercises this authority that is given to Him alone and that is His own. See *Acts 3:12, 13; 4:10; 5:3-6; 9-11; 13:2-4; 16:6-10*. *MEDM July 31, 1907, page 243.3*

Therefore, in the Church, position, office, or place, never gives any authority. The Lord Jesus, the Creator of the worlds, the Author of life, and the Fountain of revelation, when he came to this world came only to his own; yet he had no position, office, nor place. He was held aloof, ostracized, denounced, and cast out by those who did hold *all* the positions, offices, and places, in the Church of his time. The Pharisees, the priests, the scribes, the lawyers, the hypocrites, had position, office, and place. They were all ambitious for the highest place. They held position and office, and could lord it

over Him, and summon Him, and demand of Him, and sit in judgment on Him. All this they could do because of position and office in the Church; but where was their *authority* to do any of it?—Simply nowhere at all. It was all only arrogance, usurpation, and arbitrariness.*MEDM July 31, 1907, page 243.4*

Therefore Jesus told the people, “The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do”—because, as they sat in Moses’ seat they read to the people the word of God which Moses had written. That was the word of God and by whomsoever it might be spoken or read it was authoritative and to be obeyed. But “do not ye after their works; for they say and do not.” With Moses in the seat there was authority from the seat; because God was with Moses, and God’s Spirit was in him. But with a Pharisee or a scribe of that time in Moses’ seat, there was no authority from the seat nor otherwise except only in the Word which the man might read to the people, and which, because of his hypocrisy and selfish ambition, was altogether apart from him.*MEDM July 31, 1907, page 243.5*

But as to Jesus, who had no position, office, nor place, they all “wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth.” And why?—Ah: “He taught them as one having authority, and *not* as the scribes.” All that the scribes could speak was borrowed, and everybody could know that it was borrowed; it was empty and alone so far as concerned any connection of their lives or spirits with it. But when Jesus spoke even the same words that the scribes and Pharisees had spoken, everybody knew that what he said was not borrowed, but was of his very soul; was not empty, but was very substance; they knew that that word lived in him, that his spirit and the Spirit of the Word were one, and that he himself was the veritable expression of the word which he spake. When the word of the Scriptures was read or spoken by him, there was in it a weight and meaning that caused it to fall impressively upon the ears and hearts of all who heard.*MEDM July 31, 1907, page 244.1*

Thus though Jesus had neither position, nor office, nor any place, he had *authority*; and the people recognized it. And the scribes, the Pharisees, the priests, and the lawyers, who had position, office, and place, also recognized it, and grew so jealous of him that they

could not endure him any longer lest they *lose their place*; “all the world is gone after him,” we must get rid of him to save our place. “If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.”*MEDM July 31, 1907, page 244.2*

But where lay Jesus’ authority, when he had no position, nor office, nor any place?—It lay just where true authority always lies—in *the truth* which he preached *from* God, and the sincerity had purity of mind and heart with which he received and preached that truth.*MEDM July 31, 1907, page 244.3*

All true and right authority of any man in the Church comes to him only in the truth of God which he receives. If it were possible to find a man in this world who had as much of the truth of God as had Christ, in him we should find one who had all power in Heaven and earth, because of his having all the truth in Heaven and earth. The measure of truth that a man has is the only measure of true authority that he has, wherever he may be. And if he be in the highest place of responsibility in any church in the world, if he has no truth, he has no authority.*MEDM July 31, 1907, page 244.4*

Therefore Jesus said, “The princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great *exercise authority* upon them. But *it shall not be so among you*.” God has never given to any man in his Church authority to exercise authority. That is the difference between the princes of this world and the princes of God; for Christians are princes of God. God calls and sends his princes to be apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, elders, deacons, etc. He clothes them with authority in giving to them his own truth and his own call and commission to speak it, and his own personal presence to speak it, and his own personal presence by his own Spirit. He sends them to *speak* with all the authority of the conviction of the divine truth, of the heavenly commission, and of his personal presence. (*Acts 18:9, 10; 2 Timothy 4:1, 2*). But the “exercise” of authority rests wholly with him whose alone the authority is, and who is ever with the one whom he sends. *John 8:29; 20:21, 22; 3:24*. The princes of this world in places of authority, but without true authority, exercise authority. The princes of God having true authority never exercise authority. That belongs

—and the princes of God are ever happy to leave it just where it belongs—to Him to whom it is given, and whose only it is.*MEDM July 31, 1907, page 244.5*

Again let it be said that position, office, or place never gives authority. Authority that a man already has from God will qualify him for the place of position to which God calls him. And if he has not that authority*MEDM July 31, 1907, page 244.6*

August 7, 1907

“That Meeting in *Acts 15*” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 32, pp. 251, 252.

ATJ

BY ALONZO T. JONES

OF all the Scriptures that have been misused to bolster up what has already been done *without* Scripture, this in *Acts 15* relating to the meeting held at Jerusalem must be the one that has been so misused the most.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.1*

Those denominations who hold general councils—as the Catholic churches—make that meeting to be “the first general council.” Those who hold general assemblies—as the Presbyterians—make the meeting to be “the first general assembly.” Those who hold general conferences—as the Methodists and others—make it to be “the first general conference.” And by this sleight all these denominations make that meeting to sanction their general “councils,” “assemblies,” “conferences,” etc., and all that they do therein.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.2*

It is time that this scripture was studied to know what is in it. What, then, are the simple facts as they stand in the plain statements of the Scriptures?*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.3*

1. Certain men came down to Antioch from Judea, and taught the Christians at Antioch, “Except ye be circumcised, ye can not be saved.” *V, 7.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.4*

2. “Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them.” *V, 2.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.5*

3. The brethren at Antioch “determined that Paul and Barnabas and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem about this question.” *V, 2.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.6*

4. “Paul and Barnabas” and certain other of them “of the church at Antioch,” were all who went “to Jerusalem about the question.” *V, 2.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.7*

5. These “passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles; and they caused great joy unto all the brethren” in those parts; but *no one went with them* from the churches in Phoenicia or Samaria. *V, 3.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.8*

6. When they arrived at Jerusalem, “They were received *of the church and of the apostles and elders.*” *V, 4.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.9*

7. To “the church and the apostles and elders,” at that meeting on their arrival, Paul and Barnabas “declared all that God had done with them.” *V, 4.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.10*

8. Here also “there arose up certain ... saying that it was needful to circumcise the Christians from among the Gentiles. *V, 5.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.11*

9. Then “the apostles and elders *with the whole church*” “came together to consider of this matter.” *Vs. 6, 22.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.12*

10. In this second meeting there was first, “much disputing.” Then Peter spoke. *Vs. 7-11.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.13*

11. Next, “all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them.” *V, 12.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.14*

12. At last spoke James. *Vs. 13-21.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.15*

13. “Then pleased it the apostles and elders, *with the whole church*, to send *chosen men* of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas.” *V, 22.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.16*

14. “And they wrote letters by them after this manner: The apostles and elders *and brethren* send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia.” *V, 23.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.17*

By the simple facts of the plain words of the record there appears the sober truth that—*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.18*

(a) The only thing in any possible way that was in any sense general about either of the meetings in *Acts 15*, is that it was a general meeting of the *church at Jerusalem*; and nobody else present except “Paul and Barnabas and certain other” from Antioch.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.19*

(b) There were two of those meetings.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.20*

The *first* one, when those from Antioch on their arrival were “received of the church and of the apostles and elders, and they [from Antioch] declared all things that God had done with them.” *V, 4.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.21*

The *second* one, afterward when “the apostles and elders with the whole church” came together to consider the matter that had brought these from Antioch, and that had been urged anew at the first meeting. *Vs. 6, 22, 23.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.22*

(c) The two meetings were composed alike:—*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.23*

The *first* meeting was composed of “*the apostles and elders with the whole church*,” and those from Antioch. *Vs. 6, 22, 23-25.MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.24*

(d) Neither of these meetings was any more of a general council, or a general assembly, or a general conference, than the other. The only difference in the meetings is in the fact that more persons spoke in the second meeting than in the first.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.25*

(e) In the character of the two meetings, and in the persons who were present, neither meeting was any more of a general council, or a general assembly, or a general conference, than the other.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.26*

(f) And since both meetings were composed only of the church and

the apostles and elders *at Jerusalem*, with “Paul and Barnabas and certain other” *from Antioch*—if that must count for a general council, or a general assembly, or a general conference, then it is certain that *any* meeting of the whole membership of any local church or congregation, with possibly a half dozen brethren present from another local church or congregation, to consider a particular matter, is equally a general council, or a general assembly, or a general conference.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.27*

But no such thing as that is ever contemplated in the conception of those who make the record in *Acts 15* to be the precedent and sanction for general councils, general assemblies, or general conferences. What these mean by it is, that it was a council, or an assembly, or a conference, of persons from *many churches* met as delegates or “representatives” of those churches; and so, by such representatives of churches, a general council, or general assembly, or general conference, of the Christian cause as a whole.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.28*

But by the simple facts of the plain record in *Acts 15*, it is certain that neither of the two meetings there mentioned was in any sense any such thing as that. And this is confirmed by other facts of the Scripture record:*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.29*

I. Attention has already been called to the fact that though the brethren from Antioch passed through Phoenicia and Samaria on their way to Jerusalem, and “caused great joy unto all the brethren” in those regions,—where there were churches—yet no *persons*, much less any delegates or representatives of the churches there, went with those brethren to Jerusalem.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.30*

.II. Much more: In addition to the churches in Phoenicia and Samaria, there were at that time churches in Antioch in Pisidia, and “all that region;” at Iconium, Lystra and Derbe and other places in Lycaonia; and at Perga and other places in Pamphylia. (*Acts 13.*) Yet no person, much less any delegate or “representative” of any church or “field,” from any of those churches or places was present at either of the meetings at Jerusalem mentioned in *Acts 15*.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 251.31*

By the Scripture record, therefore, it is certain that neither of the meetings at Jerusalem, mentioned in *Acts 15*, was a meeting of “representatives” or even of persons, of the churches, regions, or fields of the Christian cause in general at that time. Neither of these meetings, therefore, was in any sense a meeting of delegates or representatives, as in the conception of those who make it a general council, or general assembly, or a general conference. It is therefore certain that there is not in *Acts 15* nor anywhere else in the Scriptures any record of, nor was there ever held in apostolic or New Testament times, any such thing as it meant in the term, “general council,” “general assembly,” or “general conference.” *MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.1*

Yet further: The Scripture record makes perfectly plain just why those meetings occurred at Jerusalem, and why it was only the apostles and elders and the church at *Jerusalem*, with the brethren from *Antioch*, that composed the meeting. *MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.2*

1. Those who started the disturbance at Antioch had come to Antioch “from Judea,” and evidently from the church at Jerusalem itself. For, in the letter sent out from this meeting by “the apostles and elders and brethren,” those others are referred to as “certain which went out *from us*.” *MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.3*

2. These having gone out from the church at Jerusalem, sought to ring in the apostles and elders, if not the whole of *that church*, as responsible for the doctrine that they were urging. *MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.4*

3. They even claimed that the apostles and elders and brethren at Jerusalem had sent them with “commandment” to teach that Christians must be circumcised in order to be saved. For—*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.5*

(a) At the conclusion of the discussion in the meeting “it pleased the apostles and elders with the whole church, to send *chosen men* of *their own company* to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas,” to repudiate those who had raised the issue there, and to assure the brethren at Antioch that those who had troubled them with words had *no commandment* from either apostles or elders or the church

at Jerusalem to teach any such thing, and that, instead of those having taught truth, they were really subverting souls.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.6*

(b) In addition to their sending these chosen men of their own company to tell this by word of mouth at Antioch, “the apostles and elders and brethren” at Jerusalem wrote and sent a letter, to the same purpose, declaring that “certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised and keep the law, to whom we gave no such commandment,” and “it seemed good unto us ... to send chosen men unto you ... who shall also tell you the same things by mouth.”*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.7*

The plain and easy truth of the whole matter, then, is that—*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.8*

.I. Those who went first to Antioch and raised there this issue of a false gospel, were from the church at Jerusalem.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.9*

.II. When Paul and Barnabas withstood the with the true gospel, and they could not maintain their ground by any merit of their teaching, they fell back upon their being from the church at Jerusalem and sought to carry their point by “authority,” through the claim not only that what they were teaching was what the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem taught, but that these had sent them to teach that thing.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.10*

.III. This at once threw back the whole question to the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem, and made the main question to be, *not*—Is what these men are teaching, true? *but, Is it true* that the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem are teaching thus? and did they send out these men to teach it?*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.11*

.IV. These questions necessarily could be answered only by the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.12*

.V. Therefore, the only thing to be done at this point by the brethren

at Antioch was, just what they did, to decide “that Paul and Barnabas and certain other of them should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question.”*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.13*

.VI. And when they had done so, and the apostles and elders of the whole church at Jerusalem had considered the whole matter, they unanimously repudiated those men and their teaching as having come in any way from them, and did *now send* chosen men of their own company to Antioch to tell there that those men and their teaching were repudiated, and to tell what the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem really did teach; and also sent a letter telling the same thing that the chosen men were to tell by word of mouth.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.14*

By those who had first gone to Antioch the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem had been misrepresented, had been put in a false position, and had not only been falsely pledged but had been falsely pledged to a false doctrine. The journey of the brethren from Antioch to Jerusalem was to inquire for the truth in the matter; and the two meetings of the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem with the brethren from Antioch were held to consider the matter and to make known from the apostles and elders and church at Jerusalem *themselves* the plain truth of the matter in which they had thus become involved.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.15*

It is true that the issue involved was the very foundation of the gospel; but this in no wise affects the fact that neither of the meetings held as the consequence of the issue, or in considering the question, was in any sense a general council, or a general assembly, or a general conference; but that both of the meetings were meetings only of the church and apostles and elders at Jerusalem, with the few brethren from Antioch.*MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.16*

Another thing, and a thing that should make the meeting of most suspicious “authority” as a “general council,” or a “general assembly,” or a “general conference,” even to those who hold such thing, is the fact that what it did was not held as authoritative by the two leading men in the meeting—Peter and James—“all the elders,”

and at least a very large number of the church at Jerusalem. For afterward both Peter and James with many others abandoned the ground taken in the meeting, and went over to the ground of those who had first advocated the circumcision of Christians. And so strong was the tide that even Barnabas was carried away with it. *Galatians 2:11-16; Acts 21:18-25. MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.17*

Nevertheless, Christ, who is the Head of the Church and of all Christians, by the sovereignty and guidance of his own Holy Spirit, kept his church in the straight path of “the truth of the gospel,” and even led back into that straight path those mistaken brethren. And so will he do forever—whensoever he is allowed to have his place as Head of the Church, and his Spirit his place as the Guide of his Church and of all the membership of the Church. *MEDM August 7, 1907, page 252.18*

August 14, 1907

“The ‘Why’ of the Religious Phase of the Sanitarium” The Medical Missionary, 16, 33, pp. 259-261.

ATJ

I HAVE been asked by patients in the Sanitarium to speak upon “the Religious Side of the Sanitarium and Its Work,” and to tell the “why” of it. While we have no disposition to push this matter offensively or obtrusively upon the attention of anybody, we are always happy to tell it all to any who want to know it.*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 259.1*

The original and fundamental “why” of this is because of the Bible’s being the Word of God to us. The Sanitarium was founded by Christian men for Christian purposes, and the Bible as the Word of God is the basis of all that is Christian.*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 259.2*

The Bible comes to us as the Word of God. And it will prove itself to be the Word of God to every one who will receive it as the Word of God.*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 259.3*

As certainly as it is the Word of God, it is final in all matters of which it speaks. For when *God* has spoken, there can not possibly be anything beyond. As certainly, therefore, as we profess to receive the Bible as the Word of God, it must be to us the final information and authority in all that it says. If it is not allowed to be in all things final to us, when it is not the Word of God to us, whatever we may profess.*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 259.4*

When God has spoken, and I have His word, what room can there possibly be for opinions or views of my own, that shall be different from just what that word says. No man needs a revelation from God, in order to think his own thoughts. Therefore, when the Word of God comes to us, our own opinions must be laid entirely aside. When the thoughts of God are expressed, our own thoughts must be abandoned, if we would learn from Him. “Be still, and know that I am God.” “Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man

his thoughts.... For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the Heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.” We are not to come to the Word of God, to think our *own thoughts*; but to *get the thoughts of God* with which to think.*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 259.5*

However, it is asked, How shall we know that the Bible is really the Word of God so that we can confidently accept it as the Word of God? Many say, prove to me that the Bible is the Word of God, and I will accept it.*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 259.6*

THE BIBLE ITS OWN PROOF

Very good. There is abundance of proof. Yet, bear in mind that the proof is the Word itself, and can not possibly be anywhere else. If I make to you a statement, and you require proof of it, I must present something in which you can have more confidence than in my own statement, I must cite authority that is higher authority than my own word. So, to ask proof *outside of that Word itself* that the Bible is the Word of God, is to call for authority that is superior to the authority of God. But in the nature of things there can not be any authority higher than that of God; nor can there be any more authoritative statement than that of the plain Word of God. Therefore, it is impossible that there could be cited a statement of greater weight, or worthy of more confidence than the Word of God. As certainly as it is the Word of God, it is ultimate. And it is the essential characteristic of only ultimate truth, that the proof is in itself.*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 259.7*

But it is said, There are other books that profess to be the Word of God. Yes, that is true. And this test will successfully apply to every one of them. Does it prove itself? And the certain test that of all the books that profess to be the Word of God, the Bible is the only one that can prove itself to be in truth the Word of God, lies in this truth: The man who has the most of the religion of the Bible is the most peaceable and harmless, while of the religions of all other books, those who have the most are the most dangerous.*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.1*

The Bible, then, is the Word of God to the Sanitarium management. The aim of the Bible is holiness. And *health* and *holiness* are *inseparable*. Let me make this plain by the Word of the Bible. "Ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty. Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, *perfecting holiness* in the fear of God." *MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.2*

That tells us that both physical and spiritual purity are essential to holiness. But this truth of health and holiness being inseparable stands plain in our own native language. The word "health" is an abstract noun from "whole," not from "heal." The real meaning of the word "whole" is "hale, sound, entire, complete." The original sense of the word "whole" is "hale," which signifies, "in sound health." This is illustrated in the words of Scripture, "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." *MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.3*

HEALTH FIRST

It is a most remarkable fact that the first "statute and ordinance," the very first set instruction, that God gave to His people after His mighty deliverance of them from Egypt, was instruction in the way of perfect health, and the revelation of Himself as "the Lord that healeth thee." I read it: "There he made for them a statute and an ordinance, and there he proved them, and said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I am the Lord that healeth thee." *Exodus 15:25, 26. MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.4*

I am glad to be able also to make plain the valuable truth that this relationship between sin and disease, and health and holiness, is recognized beyond the walls of this Sanitarium and even outside of

the Sanitarium system as such. In many places and by many hearts this splendid truth is recognized and loved. It has been most excellently expressed by a physician who is editor of one of the leading medical journals in the United States. I will read it to you in his own words:—*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.5*

“The relationship of sin and disease has been recognized by all great philosophic minds.... It is an old trick of the mind to rid one’s self of difficulties and responsibilities by denying the existence of facts. *He who silences his conscience by denying sin, only adds another sin to his individual burden, and another sinner to the burden of the world.**MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.6*

“Let us therefore assume as beyond discussion that atheism is unscientific, and that God lives, and that *sin is opposing and not furthering His biologic work in the world....MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.7*

“*God is a true physician, working for final normality.* He may cauterize in order to cure, and prefer amputation rather than necrosis. His patient is the entire future body and soul of humanity, not the individual members now and here existing. The wise ones of the world, the philosophers and the prophets, the leaders of men to better living, have been those who saw the far and subtle lines and laws of causation running back from disease and untimely death to *the sources of ignorance (which is also sin), of selfishness, and of wrong-doing.* This is the text of all preaching and prophecy, the burthen of all tragedy, the plot of all literature. *And it is the heart of medicine!* ... As physicians we must work to cure and prevent disease. If, as we have seen, disease is always more or less dependent upon sin, we must in a scientific prophylaxis try to stop the sin that partly or entirely generates or allows the disease....*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.8*

“Science, it is plain, has outrun morality; we know how to lengthen the average human life by many years, with a proportionate reduction of all the suffering and expense, but we are powerless to do it, because, *simply of sin.* There is no doubt that sin alone prevents a reduction of the death-rate and sickness by one-half, and a lengthening of life to 50 or 60 years. And *we have nearly or*

*quite reached the limit so far as the art of therapeutics is concerned. We can never cure a much greater proportion of the sick until we have better bodies and souls in the patients. The great progress of the future in medicine will be prevention...*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.9

“There is no prevention of disease without stifling the cause of disease. *Wherever sin exists, its works itself out finally in sickness and death.* The man who says his sole duty is to cure disease, not to both about sin or society, is a bad physician and a poor citizen. In a hundred ways he can influence his neighbors and his nation, to lessen disease and death, besides by what the text-books calls therapeutics. *The best therapeutics is to render therapeutics unnecessary.*”MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.10

This idea of the forgiveness of sins as an element in the true treatment of disease does not in any sense sanction the quackery of the so-called faith-cures. Undeniably, faith is in it; because forgiveness of sins is received and known only by means of faith. But it is the “faith which works;” not an airy, figmentary “faith” that prays and “believes” and then lies down or sits around *and does nothing*. It is the faith which upon the Word of God and the love of God teaches the forgiveness of sins and then works most vigorously to reduce fever, to eliminate poisons, and diligently to search for the physical causes of the sickness, in order that these causes shall with the sins be forever abandoned, and the true way of true health, which is inseparable from holiness, be faithfully followed in the future.MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.11

Upon this principle the philosophy of the forgiveness of sins is studied in order to know how, as a matter of practical knowledge, the forgiveness of sins enters as an element into practical medical science. And in this direction there is not far to go to find at least one important truth as to how this is. Here it is: “*Peace, peace to him that is far off, and to him that is near, saith the Lord; and I will heal him.* But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked.” *Isaiah 19:21.*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.12

The peace of God which comes to man in the forgiveness of sins and the restoration of the soul to righteousness is a distinct element in recovery from sickness and is a right way to health. And there is not an intelligent physician in the world, even though he be an avowed atheist who will not say that a disturbed mind, a troubled heart, a perplexed life, is a positive hindrance to whatever may be done to bring a person back from sickness to health; while, on the other hand, peace of mind and quietness and rest of heart are a positive aid. And that sound medical principle, which every physician recognizes, is declared in the Bible as a medical principle; and is given by the Lord directly as a medical prescription to the wick: “*Peace, peace ... saith the Lord; and I will heal him.*”*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.13*

And yet this is but an instance in illustration of the essential virtue and power of the word of God to heal. It is written: “He sent His word, and healed them.” (*Psalms 107:20*). And of the medicinal virtue of His word as such, it is written: “My son, attend to My words, incline thine ear unto My sayings. Let them not depart from thine eyes; keep them in the midst of thine heart. For they are life unto those that find them, and *health* [margin, Heb. “medicine” to all their flesh.” It is the flesh that disease takes hold of. But the words of God received into the heart, and treasured in the life, and allowed to be indeed the spring of the life—that is “health to all the flesh.” It is the Divine Physician’s own prescription for health, and the Divine virtue is in it for all who will take the “medicine” thus prescribed. The prescription is repeated in *Exodus 15:26*, and in *Deuteronomy 7:12-15*.*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 260.14*

And yet all this is but a part of the expression of the Lord’s supreme wish with respect to the health of mankind. For he says, “I wish *above all things* that thou mayest prosper and be in health.” (*3 John 2*). Indeed, He puts His wish for the prosperity of the *health* of man exactly on an equality with His wish for the prosperity of the *soul* of man. “I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth.” And this is but the repetition of the mighty truth already touched upon, that, as the opposite of sin and disease being inseparable, *health and holiness are*

inseparable.MEDM August 14, 1907, page 261.1

Thus emphasized in the Bible and its philosophy throughout, and rooted and imbedded in the very language in which we speak, is the truth as a medical principle that health and holiness are inseparably combined. Therefore, in every Christian these must also be inseparably combined; else how can we be truly and intelligently Christian? And of all things these two—health and holiness—must be inseparably combined in the physician; and only less so in the preacher. The preacher who separates them, fails to preach the principles of true holiness; and the physician who separates them, fails to practise the principles of true health. And what God has so inseparably joined together, how can any person do well in putting asunder?*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 261.2*

This is sufficient to show that health and holiness are absolutely inseparable. The aim of the Bible is holiness. Holiness and health, as it is written, “I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth.”*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 261.3*

The Sanitarium adopts that much for all people, and undertakes as far as it can do, so to see it fulfilled in things spiritual and physical. As the gospel contemplates the complete restoration of the lost in soul and body, it becomes the duty of every gospel agency to work for the entire man.*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 261.4*

And this is the “why” and “wherefore” of the religious phase of the Sanitarium as relates specifically to health.*MEDM August 14, 1907, page 261.5*

August 21, 1907

“The ‘Why’ of the Religious Phase of the Sanitarium.—II” The Medical Missionary, 16, 34, pp. 166, 167.

ATJ

ALONZO. T. JONES

THERE is another item of the religious phase of the Sanitarium, the “why” of which was especially asked for. That is, Life only in Christ. This also is simply because of the Bible. And it stands at the very threshold of the Bible. When God made man He said to him, “Of the trees of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.” The man did eat of that forbidden tree. Why then did he not die that day?—Simply because Christ gave himself, and stepped in between, and took upon him the death that was descending upon man; and gave to man opportunity to lay hold upon the eternal life, that Christ extended in place of the eternal death that was falling. And there Christ gave to man the life which is “even a vapor that appeareth for a *little time* and then vanisheth away,” that the man might have opportunity to choose and lay hold upon life that is *substance* and *eternal*. Therefore Christ said, “I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.” And in the way in which men use the life that is “a vapor,” they show just what use they would make of life that is substance and eternal. And thus they decide for themselves as to whether they can be entrusted with that life that is substance and more abundant, and that measures with the life of God. For “He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much.... And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man’s, who shall give you that which is your own?” *MEDM August 21, 1907, page 166.1*

Thus by the Bible, after the man had eaten of the forbidden tree he would never have had a chance even to breath a second time, except for the gift of Christ. And when man owes to the gift of Christ, the very breath by which he lives only this temporal life, how

could it be possible that he could have *eternal* life *without* Christ? To think that he can, is only to argue that he has life of himself, that he is self-existent and independent of God; and therefore equal with God. But that will never do. Any life at all for man is solely because of the gift of Christ; and how much more is it so as to eternal life?*MEDM August 21, 1907, page 166.2*

Another item as to the “why” and “wherefore” of the religious phase of the Sanitarium is, The observance of the Sabbath. The inquiry is not as to the observance of a day, for that is expected of all; but, Why do we observe a day different from the one recognized by the great mass of the people—the seventh day? This, too, is simply because we would have the Bible to be to us the Word of God. For the Word of God says as plainly as words can say, that “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” And this is the truth of the word of God not only in the general sense of the Bible as the word of God, in the specific sense of the Word spoken by Himself personally at Sinai with a voice that shook the earth. Nearly everywhere among Christians there is found on the walls of the churches, copies of the Ten Commandments. And the fourth of these says plainly to all, “The seventh day is the work which God has created and made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made.”*MEDM August 21, 1907, page 166.3*

The Seventh day is the Sabbath, *not* because it is the seventh day, but *because* God *made it the Sabbath*. He could have made another day the Sabbath, if he had chosen to do so. But he did choose the seventh day and made it the Sabbath. And since this is his will and his word, surely this must stand if he shall be God, and his word the word of God, to us. That may not be the day that we would have made the Sabbath. But we did not have the making of it. It is God who made the choice of the seventh day, and who made it the Sabbath. And he did this for us; for “the Sabbath was made for man.”*MEDM August 21, 1907, page 166.4*

This whole matter of our observance of the Sabbath in the Sanitarium is simply because that to us the Bible is the Word of God. Therefore, the seventh day, chosen by the Lord and made the Sabbath, and declared in his word to be the Sabbath, is the

Sabbath of the Lord in the religious phase of the Sanitarium. True we could refuse to recognize or observe this Sabbath of the Lord. But that would be disobedience; that would be saying, I do not want God's will or his way of His Word. But if we should *put another day in the place* of the one chosen of God, and should observe this other day instead of the one which he has made and designated, that would be *more* than disobedience; that would be to put ourselves above him. For it would be only to say that he was not sufficiently wise to make the right choice or to do the right thing, while we are sufficient in all this to make exactly the right choice and to do precisely the right thing. And this would be nothing else than to require that God and his word should give way to us and our will; that his should cease and ours prevail. Yet even if we were to do that, and succeed in persuading many, and even all, others to do it, it never could be right nor could it prevail, for God will ever be God and his word stands forever. *MEDM August 21, 1907, page 166.5*

I stated that God could have made another day the Sabbath if he had wished to have it so. For, surely, when creation was accomplished only by his speaking the word he could have created the worlds in less than six days if he had chosen to do so. He could have created all in five days and rested the sixth, and blessed and hallowed and sanctified the sixth day; then the sixth day would have been the Sabbath, as the seventh day now is. Or he *could* have created all in four days, and rested the fifth, and made it the Sabbath; or in three days and made the fourth, or in two days and made the third, or in one day, and made the second day the Sabbath. But he could not have created all things in one day, and then made that first day the Sabbath. For Sabbath means rest, and Sabbath-day, rest day. And the day he worked, could not be also the day he rested. The day in which he created all, would necessarily be the first day; and it being impossible for that to be the rest day too, it would, therefore, manifestly be impossible for even the Lord to make the first day the Sabbath. Yet that is the very day that has been set up as a Sabbath *by somebody*, in the *place of the day chosen and made the Sabbath, by the Lord*. I remarked, a while ago, that for us to refuse to observe the Sabbath that God has made would be disobedience; but for us to observe another day instead of the one appointed by Him, would be to put ourselves

above him in wisdom and righteousness. And just this thing has been done. And whoever it was that accomplished this thing certainly went the whole length; for in fixing on the first day of the week to be the Sabbath, they went beyond even what God could do; and thus put themselves above God, not only as to wisdom and righteousness, but as to power; and thus would show themselves in all things independent of God, and above him.*MEDM August 21, 1907, page 166.6*

But that will never do. God is still God. His will and work stand forever supreme. And in recognition of this, we yield to him in wisdom, in righteousness, and in power, accepting the Sabbath which he has made, and enjoying the rest, the blessing, the holiness, and the sanctification, of it. For just this is the purpose of the Sabbath of the Lord as it is written, "Hallow my Sabbaths and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." Is it not a good thing for a person to know, really to *know* that the Lord is his God? Yet this is precisely the purpose of the Sabbath. The Sabbath of the Lord, therefore, is a blessed means of God's revealing himself to the knowledge of men.*MEDM August 21, 1907, page 166.7*

The Sabbath is given, that by hallowing it we may know that the Lord is our God. God is known only through Christ. Therefore, the Sabbath is divinely established means by which men may know God as he is revealed in Jesus Christ. And by observing this Sabbath of the Lord, in spirit and in truth, men ever grow in the knowledge of God. And this even to eternity, for when the new heavens and the new earth shall be brought in, then "from one Sabbath to another shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." *Isaiah 66:23. MEDM August 21, 1907, page 267.1*

September 11, 1907

“The Everlasting Covenant Is not ‘Obey and Live’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 37, pp. 294, 295.

ATJ

BY ALONZO. T. JONES

IN a recent publication it is said, “We have found the condition of the covenant between God and his creatures to be, “Obey and Live,” and, “The compact, or covenant, under which Adam began his existence was that God promised life only on condition of Adam’s obedience.”*MEDM September 11, 1907, page 294.1*

Now as a matter of fact, is it true that Adam began his existence under an agreement between him and God? The only possible way in which it could be true that Adam “began his existence” under an agreement of any kind whatever, would have to be that he entered into that agreement before he existed. For if his existence began before the agreement was made, then it is plain that he did not begin his existence under that agreement. And if it be true that Adam began his existence under that agreement, then it is equally plain that the agreement existed before he did, and the only way that the agreement between him and God could exist before he existed, would, in the nature of things, have to be that he entered into that agreement before he existed.*MEDM September 11, 1907, page 294.2*

Note also that according to this statement this agreement was that “God promise life *only* on condition of Adam’s obedience.” As certainly then as life was promised him only on a condition, so certainly he did not already have life; and not having life, he agreed to obey in order that he might have it; as it was “only” on that “condition” that he could have life. This statement would demonstrate that Adam entered into this agreement before he had life; that is, before he existed; and did really “begin his existence” under that compact. Does anybody need to be told that such a thing as that is, in every conceivable sense, an absolute impossibility?*MEDM September 11, 1907, page 294.3*

Since Adam and every other intelligence must necessarily be alive before they could possibly enter into any compact, it follows in the nature of things that each one began his existence with life, and not with any such thing as an agreement to do something in order to get life or to have it. Therefore, the simple and plain fact, and the plain Scripture truth, is that Adam and angels began their existence with life; and that this life was, by the gift of the grace of God, in creating them living souls; and was not, in any sense, under, nor was it by virtue of, any compact or bargain or condition or anything of the kind.*MEDM September 11, 1907, page 294.4*

According to the statement noted above, God promised to give to them life provided that they would obey; and on their part they promised to obey so that they could have the life, and had to do it before they could have the life. Then when they did do it and so got the life, how was it in fact and in truth that they got the life? There is only one possible answer, and that answer is perfectly clear—it is that they got life by their own works.*MEDM September 11, 1907, page 295.1*

When God promised life only on condition of obedience, then it is positive and plain that their hope of life rested only on their obedience. And since God's part could not come in till their part was fulfilled, since God's promise could not come in till their promise was made good in obedience, it follows that their hope of obedience rested only on the virtue of their own promise to obey. And thus God's everlasting covenant is made to rest on the promise of creatures.*MEDM September 11, 1907, page 295.2*

In perfect consistency with this is the suggestion often met with of God's eternal or everlasting covenant being "broken," and "renewed," "broken" and "renewed." But if the covenant were God's indeed and rested on God's promise only, then it never was broken and never could be broken. For God neither will nor can break his own promise; and no creature can break God's promise. And hence it never could require renewing. An everlasting covenant would be unbreakable.*MEDM September 11, 1907, page 295.3*

Righteousness and life truly go together. But if Adam and all men and angels could have life only by their own works, in fulfillment of

their own promise to obey, it is plain that they got righteousness by their own works in fulfillment of their own promise, and so this righteousness was absolutely and exclusively their own righteousness. It was absolutely righteousness by works and not by faith; it was exclusively *their own* righteousness, by *their own works*, upon their own promise and not in any sense the righteousness of God, which is by faith.*MEDM September 11, 1907, page 295.4*

Since God's covenant is identical with his law of Ten Commandments, this theory suggests that God's law must be renewed when it is broken! Why should not the real gospel thought be recognized that it is the *sinner*, and not the law, that needs to be renewed? that it is the *person who fails*, and not the covenant *Continued on page 296 Continued from page 295* that cannot possibly fail, that needs to be renewed.*MEDM September 11, 1907, page 295.5*

Such conception presents to us God as one who did not have enough confidence in his own goodness or the merit of his own truth or the worth of his own grace, to lead him to trust *to this* to win their free confidence and loving obedience; but, to secure it, he must put them under bonds of a legal system of bargain and "compact," of "condition" and proviso!*MEDM September 11, 1907, page 296.1*

But that is not God at all. That is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The very inherent name of the true God is "The Lord, the Lord God; merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." And he has enough confidence in his own mercy and grace, and long suffering and goodness and truth and forgiveness, to depend upon this alone to secure eternally the spontaneous free-flowing, grateful service of his created intelligences. And this was settled for all eternity before ever there was settled for all eternity before ever there was a creature or any creation at all.*MEDM September 11, 1907, page 296.2*

Intelligence is essential to virtue. Freedom of choice is essential to intelligence, and freedom of choice is essential to virtue. God made angels and men intelligent. He made them to be moral. He

therefore made them free to choose; and he eternally respects that freedom of choice. He made all intelligences free to choose him. This perfect freedom of choice to glorify him, carries in itself the freedom of choice not to do so. But for any intelligence to choose not to glorify God is sin. Therefore, in the nature of things, freedom of choice involves the possibility of sin.*MEDM September 11, 1907, page 296.3*

September 18, 1907

“The Everlasting Covenant Is not ‘Obey and Live’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 38, p. 302.

ATJ

BY ALONZO T. JONES

(Continued)

THEN as God created angels and men free to choose, and thus free to choose to sin, did he not, therefore, have to provide against this possible choice before they were created? Did he not have to provide for the possibility of sin, before ever a single creature was created?—Most assuredly; *and he did so*. And this provision which he then made is an essential part of that eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord, and which is revealed in the preaching of the everlasting gospel.*MEDM September 18, 1907, page 302.1*

Let us go back to when there was no created thing; back to the eternal counsels of the Godhead. The existence of God is not a self-satisfied existence. His love is not self-love. His joy is not fulfilled in wrapping himself within himself and sitting solitary and self-centered. His love is satisfied only in flowing out to those who will receive it and enjoy it to the full. His joy is fulfilled only in carrying to an infinite universe full of blessed intelligences the very fulness of eternal joy.*MEDM September 18, 1907, page 302.2*

Standing then in thought with him before there was a single intelligent creature created, he desires that the universe shall be full of intelligences enjoying his love to the full. In order to do this, they must be free to choose him and to choose to serve him. But in their freedom to choose to serve him lies also the freedom to choose not to serve him or themselves, life or not life. For to choose not him is to choose not life, and to choose not life is to choose death.*MEDM September 18, 1907, page 302.3*

But this involves the possibility of the entrance of sin, the possibility that some will choose not to serve him, that some will choose the

way of sin. Shall he then refuse to create, because if he does it must be with the possibility that sin may enter, which is the very opposite of his very nature?—This would be but eternally to remain self-centered and solitary. More than this, such a shrinking would in itself be but to cease to be God. For what would be the worth of a God who cannot do what he desires? Who cannot fulfill his own will?*MEDM September 18, 1907, page 302.4*

So, then, since he is God he is Creator and he will create realms of intelligences. But, lo! He is to create them free to choose, and therefore with the possibility of their choosing not his way, and therefore with the possibility of their sinning. Shall he then seek to guard against the entrance of sin, by putting them all under bonds to keep the peace? under bonds of a bargain and “compact,” upon “condition” and proviso, that they will obey, that they will keep his law, that they will not sin? and this all in order that they may secure life from him? No, eternally, no! Such a thing as that would be the surest possibly guaranty of the entrance of sin. And even until sin might enter, the service would be only the service of legality, their obedience only their own, upon their own promise, and their righteousness only of themselves and of the law. That, therefore, is eternally *not* the way of God.*MEDM September 18, 1907, page 302.5*

No; thank the Lord, such as that is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. He made all intelligences free to choose, and to *think as they choose*; and therefore free to sin if they choose. And at the same time, in his infinite love and eternal righteousness, he purposed to give *himself a sacrifice to redeem all* who should sin; and give them even a *second freedom* to choose him or themselves, to choose life or death. And those who the second time and against all this would choose not him who is their life,—let them have what they have chosen, which could be only death. And those who would choose life,—the universe full of them,—let them enjoy to the full that which they have chosen—even eternal life, the fulness of perfect love, and the dear delights of unalloyed virtue and joy forevermore.*MEDM September 18, 1907, page 302.6*

This is God, the living God, the God of love, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is fully able to do whatsoever he will,

and yet leave all his creatures free. This is he who from the days of eternity “worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.” And this is “the mystery of his will.... which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things *in Christ*, both which are *in heaven*, and which are *on earth*; even in him,” and that “God may be all” in each one and “in all.” This is “the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord”; and of which the gospel in this world is only the revelation. *Ephesians 3:8-11; 1 Peter 1:22. MEDM September 18, 1907, page 302.7*

And this is simply why is it that whosoever,—cherub, angel, or man,—hardens himself against all this infinity of the goodness, mercy, and grace of God, in confirming to the limit his choice *not* to have *Him*, thereby makes of himself only a very devil. *MEDM September 18, 1907, page 302.8*

(To be Continued)

September 25, 1907

“The Everlasting Covenant Is not ‘Obey and Live’” The Medical Missionary, 16, 39, pp. 309, 310.

ATJ

BY ALONZO T. JONES

(Continued)

AGAIN I ask, What were the angels and what was Adam when they began their existence? Intellectually, morally, and spiritually were they mere bodies of pulp? people that could receive impressions and take shape only by pressure from without?*MEDM September 25, 1907, page 309.1*

What saith the Scriptures? Adam was created in the image of God. *Genesis 1:26, 27*. He was clothed and crowned with glory and honor. *Psalms 8:5; Hebrews 2:7*. In the very first hours of his existence he stood in a mind of such compass, of such penetrative power, of such flexibility, and yet of such precision, that he could read instantly each created thing, and run in succession through the whole realm of beast and fowl and at sight catch the secret of the very nature of each, and express the thought of God as therein manifested. In heart and mind, in thought and will, he was so at one with God in the Spirit of God that every faculty was but the faculty of the divine mind; and all this upon his own free choice. *Genesis 2:18-20*. And even he was ye “lower than the angels.” *Hebrews 2:7*.*MEDM September 25, 1907, page 309.2*

Surely such splendid intelligences as those were not held up by God for a bargain, for a “compact,” for a promise, upon condition and proviso that they would obey so that they could have life, and that “God promised them life only on condition of obedience!”*MEDM September 25, 1907, page 309.3*

No, eternally, no! They already *had* life from the Author of life. They dwelt joyously in the very presence of Him who of himself was their life, and with whom is the Fountain of life. *Deuteronomy 30:20; Psalm 36:9*. They beheld the face of Him who is also the Fountain

of light, and in whose light they saw light. And as they with open face thus beheld his glory they were changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord. *Matthew 18:20; 2 Corinthians 3:18*. Their life was from him; and since “righteousness and life go together,” their righteousness was from him. They lived, *from him and by him and in him and with him*; and they *were righteous, from him, and by him, and in him*. Thus their righteousness was the righteousness of God, and not of *themselves*; not their own righteousness which was of the law, but the *righteousness of God which is by faith*. *MEDM September 25, 1907, page 309.4*

They knew no such things as “obey and live.” No; they *lived*. And they knew *one to live from God and in God*. They lived from him who was *their life*. They lived by him and in him and with him who is the Fountain of life. And in the *very living* thus, obedience was manifested in the very manifestation of the life and righteousness of God in them. It was not an obedience of outward compliance, nor of legalistic form. It was an obedience of the inspiration of the life and love of God; an obedience freely and unconsciously flowing from within because of the possession of the *life and love and righteousness of God* in the fulness of the possession of the holy Spirit of God. *MEDM September 25, 1907, page 309.5*

I am not in any way either saying or intimating that Adam and the angels did not keep the law of God before they sinned. What I *am* saying is that not one of them ever did it in order to be righteous, nor in order to get life, nor to have life; not one of them ever *promised* to obey or keep the law in order that he might have righteousness, nor in order that he might have life for any other purpose, nor for any reason whatever; God never held them up on a bargain or agreement or any “condition” requiring of them a *promise of obedience* before they *could have life*. *MEDM September 25, 1907, page 309.6*

The universe of God is not a universe of bondage, but of perfect freedom. It is not a universe of the works of the law, but of grace through faith by the promise of God *alone* and altogether and forever. *MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.1*

But why was the covenant at Sinai a covenant of bondage? Didn't they promise to obey and keep his law,—the Ten Commandments? —Certainly.*MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.2*

And is not obedience to God in the keeping of his law a good thing? —Unquestionably.*MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.3*

Then wasn't it a good thing that they promised?—Most assuredly.*MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.4*

Then what was the difficulty? Where was the fault?—The difficulty was not in the thing that they promised to do, but in their *promise to do that thing*. The covenant from Sinai is declared by the Scriptures to have been faulty; that it was faulty in the promises, and that the fault was found “*with them.*” *Hebrews 8:7, 8*. Yet all that they did was to promise that they would obey the voice of God and keep the Ten Commandments. Therefore by the plain word of the Scriptures it was a fault for the people at Sinai to promise to obey God's voice and keep his law *in order to have* God be their God, and they to be his people. And this simply for the reason that *they could not do it*. It was, therefore, a fault for them to enter into a compact of “obey and live.”*MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.5*

It will doubtless be said, “Of course, this was true of *them* because they were sinners; but it could not be true of angels and of Adam at the beginning of their existence and before they were sinners.”*MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.6*

I say deliberately that it is a fault for any person in the universe, either angel or man, at the beginning of his existence or at any other time, to promise to obey the law of God in order that he may have life or righteousness, or for any other purpose or for any reason whatever. It is a fault for either angels or men ever to enter into any compact of “obey and live,” or to offer to God obedience as the satisfaction of a “condition” upon which “only” they can secure the promise of life. And this for the reason that under such “compact” and upon such “condition” their obedience and therefore *their righteousness* would be only of themselves and of the law. And self-righteousness is no more true righteousness, and no more acceptable to God in a heavenly angel than it is in an earthly Pharisee.*MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.7*

Why, the Lord Jesus himself, the Creator and Lord of all, the glory of God and the Light of the universe, when he came down to this world and took “the form of a servant,” could not manifest *his own* righteousness, righteousness of *himself*; but must “empty himself” and must “do nothing” of *himself*; and this in order that the righteousness of *God* might appear—the righteousness of God by *faith*. *Philippians 2:5-7; John 5:30; 12:49; 14:10*. And when the Lord of glory “in the form of a servant” could not do this, then no angel (all of whom in fact are but servants, *Revelation 19:10; 22:9*) could, or can, ever do it. And when the Lord of glory himself could not do it in “the form of a servant” on earth, no angel could ever do it in heaven. *MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.8*

What then?—Just this: The Lord of glory emptying *himself*, and doing nothing of *himself*, in order that *not* even *his own* righteousness should appear, but only the righteousness of God,—as the mighty and glorious “Leader” that he is, he has, *in this*, *revealed the way*, has *set the pace*, and has lifted the true standard, to *all the universe*, of the only way, to the only righteousness that can ever be acceptable to God—the righteousness of God alone; the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ. *MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.9*

For when in truth did God give Christ, and give himself in him? When, in truth, did Christ offer himself? When did he “empty himself”? The answer is, “Before the foundation of the world (*1 Peter 1:20*); before there was any creature, yea, even before there was any creation. Creation itself rests upon the grace of God who *denies* himself, who *gives* himself, who *empties* himself, who *gives* himself, who *empties* himself, for the life, the joy, and the good of his creatures. And the divine thing of emptying himself, that God might appear all in all, this divine thing that was done *in truth* before there was any creation, and that was done *in very fact* on the cross of Calvary—*this* divine thing it is, that is the only way of righteousness anywhere in the wide universe, or in eternity. *MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.10*

Righteousness, whether to men, to angels, to bright seraphim, or to exalted cherubim, comes not by obedience of their own. It comes *only* from the grace of God through the faith of Jesus Christ; *never*

their own righteousness which is of the law, *but* always only “that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.”*MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.11*

And in this word “faith” I mean not a mere theoretical notion, but “faith” in its only true meaning of the *will submitted* to him, the *heart yielded* to him, and the *affections fixed* upon him. This only is faith; and this itself by the grace and gift of God. And this faith, of the will submitted to God through Christ, of the heart yielded to God in Christ, and the affections fixed upon God by Christ—this is the faith of angels as truly as of men. And by this faith and in this faith of the Lord Jesus, all the glad array of holy angels, bright seraphim, and beatified cherubim, as well as men, empty themselves of all thought of self, of all thought of any righteousness of self or of law, and receive the righteousness *of God*, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, through his boundless grace.*MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.12*

And “obey?”—Of course they obey. But the obedience is not an outward compliance, or of law; but the inward, free-flowing service of love, which is the only true obedience in heaven or earth. And in this obedience, of course, they *live*; for it is the very expression of the life and righteousness of God which is in them by the faith of Jesus Christ through the grace of God.*MEDM September 25, 1907, page 310.13*

October 9, 1907

“Prophets and Prophecy in the New Testament” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 41, pp. 323-325.

ATJ

BY ALONZO T. JONES

PROPHETS and prophesying belong in the New Testament Church. *MEDM October 9, 1907, page 323.1*

The prophet Joel foretold it, and Pentecost introduced it in the Christian Church. For of Pentecost Peter said: “But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.” *Acts 2:16-18. MEDM October 9, 1907, page 323.2*

And of the gifts of the Holy Spirit in the Church, it is written: “And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.” *Ephesians 4:11, 12*. “For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; ... to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; ... And God hath set some in the church, first apostles secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, etc.” *1 Corinthians 12:8-11, 28*. And, “Despise not prophesying.” *1 Thessalonians 5:20*. Of these gifts, the gift of prophesying is chiefly to be desired. And so it is written: “Follow after charity, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy.... I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied: for greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret, that the church may receive edifying.” “He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth the church.” *1 Corinthians 14:1, 4, 5. MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.1*

All may prophesy. For it is written: "I would that ye *all* spake with tongues; but rather that ye prophesied." "If *all* prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all: and thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth.... For ye *may all prophesy* one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." *1 Corinthians 14:5, 24, 25, 31. MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.2*

The inspired definition of prophesying is given. Thus: "He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort." *1 Corinthians 14:3*. Note, however, that this is not a mere casual speaking in social meeting, nor is it even the preaching of a sermon. Prophesying is a gift of the Spirit; therefore it is the speaking to men "unto edification, and exhortation, and comfort," by the gift, the power, the inspiration, of the Holy Spirit. This speaking by the gift and inspiration of the Spirit, could also be manifested in the foretelling of events as we shall see. Such is the truth and the definition, by the Scriptures, as to prophesying, in the New Testament and in the New Testament Church. *MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.3*

The first definite mention of prophets in the New Testament Church, that is after Pentecost, is in *Acts 11:27, 28*: "In these days came prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the world; which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cesar." *MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.4*

The next is in *Acts 13:1*: "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul." *MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.5*

The next is in *Acts 15:32*. Judas and Silas were the "chosen men" selected by "the apostles and elders with the whole church" at Jerusalem to carry to Antioch the letter that was sent from them to Antioch. When the letter had been read to the brethren at Antioch, "they rejoiced for the consolation. And Judas and Silas, being

prophets themselves, exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them.”*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.6*

The next is in *Acts 21:4*, where, though neither the word prophet nor prophesying is used, it is plainly a manifestation of the gift of prophecy. Paul and his company came to Tyre; “and finding disciples, we tarried there seven days; who said to Paul *through the Spirit* that he should not go up to Jerusalem.” Paul, however, continued his journey toward Jerusalem.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.7*

The next is in *Acts 21:9-11*. When Paul and his company came to Cesarea, to the house of Philip the evangelist, it is written: “The same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy. And as we tarried there many days, there came down from Judea a certain prophet, named Agabus. And when he was come unto us, he took Paul’s girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said: Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles.” And this came to pass as we read in the same chapter, *verse 27*, and onward in the following chapters.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.8*

Those are all the instances that are recorded in which the gift of prophecy was actually manifested among the disciples in the New Testament Church, excepting, of course, in the writings of the apostles in their epistles and in the book of Revelation, and when baptized with the Holy Ghost as in *Acts 19:6*. This is not in any sense to imply that these are by any means all the instances of the manifestation of the gift; it is only to state the fact that those instances are all that are recorded.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.9*

These, however, were written for our learning. What, then, is given in these things for us to learn?*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.10*

First, as already given, the definition of “prophesying,” in the plain words of Scripture: “He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort.” *That*, being the definition and instruction of the Spirit of inspiration himself, can never be denied, nor qualified, nor modified.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page*

Second: That the gift to prophesy is chiefly to be desired, and that all may have this gift: “Desire spiritual gifts; but rather that ye may prophesy.... For ye may all prophesy.” And “If all prophesy, he that cometh in will report that God is in you of a truth.” *MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.12*

Third: That this speaking by the gift and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, “unto edification, and exhortation, and comfort” may also be manifested in the foretelling of events, as the Spirit may will and by whom he may choose. For in the instances recorded, *both* these phases of the manifestation of the gift are clearly indicated. *MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.13*

In Agabus the gift was clearly manifested in the foretelling of events. *MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.14*

Also in the disciples at Tyre, the gift partook of this characteristic; for, though the record does not say that they told Paul what would befall him at Jerusalem, as did Agabus, they did tell him “*through the Spirit* that he *should not* go up to Jerusalem.” Thus, though it was not a revelation of *just what* would come, it was a revelation that there was *something to be avoided*, though just *what* it was might not be specified. *MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.15*

The other instances are evidently manifestations of the gift “unto edification, and exhortation, and comfort.” For though Philip had four daughters “which did prophesy,” and though Paul and his company were at Philip’s house “many days” where these daughters were, yet none of them said anything to Paul about the danger before him, or what would be done with him at Jerusalem. Nothing of this was told till “there came down from Judea a certain prophet named Agabus.” But “when he was come,” then the thing was foretold. *MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.16*

Likewise in the cases of Judas and Silas it is evidently this manifestation of the gift “unto edification, and exhortation, and comfort,” and not in the foretelling of events. For it is plainly stated that when they delivered the letter at Antioch, “they *exhorted* the brethren with many words, and *confirmed* them.” *MEDM October 9,*

1907, page 324.17

In addition to this indication we have the fact that Silas accompanied Paul in his preaching through Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece even to Corinth, through many remarkable vicissitudes and notable crisis, yet in all the story there is not even a hint that in a single instance there was manifested by Silas the gift of prophecy in foretelling any event. Yet Silas was a prophet.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.18*

There is not only no hint that he did foretell, or foreknow, but there are plain indications that he did not do so. For Silas was with Paul in Asia Minor where, forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia and the Spirit suffered them not to go into Bithynia, they came down to Troas and did not know what next to do. Yet they were not told by Silas the prophet what next they should do, but “a vision appeared to Paul in the night” in which there stood a man of Macedonia saying, “Come over and help us. And after he had seen the vision, we endeavored to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us to spread the gospel unto them.” *Acts 16:6-10. MEDM October 9, 1907, page 324.19*

Again: Silas was with Paul at Corinth. Yet though he was a prophet, it was not by him that the Lord told Paul to stay in Corinth. But “then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace; for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee: for I have much people in this city.” *Acts 18:5, 9, 10. MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.1*

Now if Silas had the gift of prophecy, in the sense of foreknowing and foretelling, then when he was the personal and chosen traveling companion and fellow worker of Paul, why should it not have been known and told by him what they should do when they came to Troas, and that Paul should stay in Corinth, instead of these things having to be made known to Paul by the Lord himself in visions in the night.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.2*

These facts certainly indicate that Judas and Silas and Philip's daughters were prophets in the sense of speaking “unto men edification, and exhortation, and comfort,” and not in the sense of foreknowing and foretelling events; while Agabus and the disciples

at Tyre had the gift in the sense of foreknowing and foretelling.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.3*

Fourth: There is another item that is plainly for our consideration and learning. Judas and Silas were prophets. We first meet them as “chief men among the brethren at Jerusalem” in the meeting that discussed the question of circumcision about which Paul and Barnabas came up from Antioch to Jerusalem. They were “chosen” by the “apostles and elders with the whole church” in that meeting to go to Antioch and tell “by mouth” as also to carry the letter in which was *written* the message sent by that assembly to the brethren at Antioch.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.4*

At that time two meetings were held in Jerusalem by the church and the apostles and elders, with the brethren from Antioch. At both these meetings the question was discussed, and at the second meeting there was “much disputing.” And these two men who were prophets were there, and were “chief men among the brethren.” And yet the question at issue, the question that had caused “no small dissension and disputation” at Antioch, and over which there was “much disputing” in the meeting at Jerusalem,—*this question* was not settled in that meeting by those prophets nor by anything that they said or did. They are not even mentioned in any connection with the question or with the meeting, till the matter is all settled and the word is to be sent to Antioch. And even then they are not mentioned as prophets till they have come to Antioch, where, as “being prophets themselves” they “exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them.”*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.5*

Again: After those meetings in Jerusalem, at which that question was settled, Peter and “certain who came from James,” at Antioch, strongly believed the same old issue and showed that with them it was not yet settled. And “there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets.” Yet neither then did any prophet deliver any revelation to decide the matter or to settle the question. No; Paul withstood Peter to the face and spoke openly before them all “the truth of the gospel”; and the Holy Spirit himself settled the question.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.6*

Fifth: There is yet another thing in the record that is for our consideration and learning. The disciples at Tyre “said to Paul *through the Spirit*, that he *should not go up to Jerusalem*.” But Paul went on the way to Jerusalem. As he was on the way he came to the house of Philip at Cesarea, where the prophet Agabus met him and told him how the Jews at Jerusalem would bind him and deliver him to the Gentiles.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.7*

From these revelations of the Spirit, those who were of Paul’s company, as well as the brethren at Cesarea, understood that it was the mind of the Spirit that Paul should not go to Jerusalem. They therefore all “besought him not to go up to Jerusalem,” yet he would not listen to this, but exclaimed, “What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus. And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying, The will of the Lord be done.” *Acts 21:4, 10-14. MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.8*

It is not for any man to say whether Paul did right or did wrong, in that matter. With any question of the right or wrong of it we can have nothing at all to do. But the *record* and the *facts* are for our learning. Therefore—*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.9*

.(a) It is plain and certain that the disciples at Tyre did say to Paul, and did say it “*through the Spirit*, that he *should not go up to Jerusalem*.”*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.10*

.(b) It is plain and certain that the prophet Agabus did say to him, “Thus saith *the Holy Ghost*, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle.”*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.11*

.(c) It is plain and certain that all who were with him understood that it was the mind and counsel of the Holy Spirit that he should not go to Jerusalem, and therefore they besought him not to go.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.12*

.(d) It is plain and certain that he would not be thus persuaded, and did go straight on to Jerusalem.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.13*

(e) And it is equally plain and certain that after all this neither the

Christians nor the prophets separated from Paul, nor ostracized him, nor denounced him, nor whispered against him, as one who “didn’t believe the testimonies,” or as one who disregarded the counsel of the Lord,” now anything of the kind. No. They simply said, “The will of the Lord be done,” and left it there, with Paul and the Lord. Nor yet did the Lord separate from him, nor denounce him, nor require his children to separate from him. Neither did the Holy Spirit turn against him and discredit him among his brethren and try to break him down and destroy his life’s work.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.14*

No, no, no. But when he would not be persuaded, but would go up to Jerusalem, the brethren went with him, and the Holy Spirit and the Lord went with him. And when all came upon him, against which the brethren had tried their best to persuade him, still, at least, some of the brethren, and the Holy Spirit, and the Lord Jesus, and the Heavenly Father, remained with him, and comforted him, and strengthened him and preserved him and delivered him.*MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.15*

It is true that afterward, whether for this cause or some other equally groundless, all those that were in Asia turned away from him. And at nearly the very last, at one time, no man stood with him, but all men forsook him. But they had far better all have stood with him through all to the very end; for the Lord stood with him and strengthened him, and delivered him from every evil work, and preserved him unto his Heavenly kingdom. *2 Timothy 1:15; 4:16-18. MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.16*

Thus in the New Testament Church the gift of prophecy was and is to be manifested both in “men’s speaking unto edification, and exhortation, and comfort,” and in men’s foreknowing and foretelling. In the first phase, it is chiefly to be desired by all believers, and all may have the gift and all may prophesy. In the second phase, not all could be prophets, but only such as God should choose and set in the church. *1 Corinthians 12:28, 29, 17, 18. MEDM October 9, 1907, page 325.17*

October 30, 1907

“In the Field” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 44, pp. 350, 352.

ATJ

LEAVING Battle Creek, August 17, the time till the 26th was spent by special invitation in attendance at the Convocation of Ministers and Assembly of the General Conference of the Seventh-day Baptists, at Niles and Alfred, New York. A hearty Christian welcome was accorded by ministers and people, in all their meetings and exercises; and the ten days were most enjoyably spent among those splendid Christian people; to all but about a half dozen of whom I was at first and by sight a total stranger, but by none of whom either at first or afterward was I in any wise treated as any other than a Christian brother.*MEDM October 30, 1907, page 350.1*

After the Conference adjourned, on the night of the 26th, I remained at Alfred over Sabbath, the 31st, the guest of Pastor and Mrs. L. C. Randolph, of the Alfred Church, preaching Thursday night the 29th and Sabbath, the 31st. Alfred is a beautiful place, and a town of excellent people; and my stay there was a real pleasure from beginning to end.*MEDM October 30, 1907, page 352.1*

Leaving Alfred the night after Sabbath, August 31, I went to Washington, D. C., where I spent two weeks in a tent-meeting with Brother Sheafe. Throughout the two weeks of meetings the attendance was good and the interest excellent; and both interest and attendance increased continually. The attendance was a thousand or more on Sunday nights, and from two hundred to three hundred on other nights. The meetings were to continue two weeks after I left there; so the results of the work during the tent season could not be reported. But it is certain that Brother Sheafe and his people have everything to encourage them in the work of the gospel message.*MEDM October 30, 1907, page 352.2*

From Washington I went to Newark, N. J., where for two weeks I helped Brother Franke in his tent-meeting, in that city. This happened to be just in the time of the equinoctial storms so that the attendance was not as large as otherwise it would well have been.

Yet even under the disadvantages of the stormy time the attendance was well worth while and the interest was good.*MEDM October 30, 1907, page 352.3*

From Newark I went to New Haven, Conn.. Westerly and Providence, R. I., visiting friends of the truth, and preaching in Providence Sabbath and Sunday four times, October 5 and 6. From Providence I went, by invitation, to West Newton, Mass., where I preached in a Baptist Church twice on Sunday, October 12, and on Wednesday night, October 16; and held Bible studies in a private house on other nights, October 9-15.*MEDM October 30, 1907, page 352.4*

Sabbath, October 19, I preached at 11:00 A. M. in the Seventh-day Baptist church at Westerly, R. I., to the regular congregation of which Rev. W. L. Burdick is pastor, and at 3:00 P. M. in a hall in the same town to another assembly.*MEDM October 30, 1907, page 352.5*

Sunday night, October 20, I preached in a public hall in Irvington, N. J.*MEDM October 30, 1907, page 352.6*

In all these places the one general theme of the preaching was the deep and far-reaching meaning of current events, national and international, and the only preparation that can enable any to meet these things in the truest way for the best good of themselves or mankind in general for their best good, whether for this world or the world to come: Righteousness, and temperance in view of the judgment to come; individuality—each one to know God himself for himself, through personal faith in Jesus Christ, and led by the Spirit of God—as against the universal spirit of combine that characterizes the business, industrial, and religious world of today, by which all are brought under the domination of man, with the crushing out of all individuality, and the enforced worship according to the dictates of the creeds and councils of a religion utterly false. Thousands of people are asking themselves the meaning and tendency of all these things; and they are glad to have the answer from the Scriptures of truth, clear and plain. This is a wonderful time, and there are more wonderful things to tell concerning the time and the events of the time.*MEDM October 30, 1907, page*

352.7

November 20, 1907

“Religious Liberty” *The Medical Missionary*, 16, 47, pp. 369-371.

ATJ

BY ALONZO T. JONES

GOD created man free. When man by sin was separated and lost from that freedom, Christ came to restore him fully to it. The way of God and of Christ, therefore, is the way of liberty. And the work of God through Christ with mankind in the whole history of the world has been to make plain this way and to give to man the absolute assurance of this “soul liberty” which is the only true liberty. *MEDM November 20, 1907, page 369.1*

“Liberty” is “freedom from the domination of others or from restricting circumstances.” In the nature of things there is no rightful room for the domination of others in the life and affairs of the soul of the individual person. This is peculiarly and supremely the realm of God alone, who created man in his own image and for his own glory; and who created each person individually and personally responsible and answerable to him alone. *MEDM November 20, 1907, page 369.2*

Yet man, sinful and unruly man, has never been willing to allow God to have his place in and with the soul of the individual man; but has always been ambitious and ready to claim that place for himself, and by every means and contrivance possible to make this claim effective. History itself, as it relates to general principles and not to details, is hardly anything else than a succession of attempts upon the grandest possible scale to make successful this arrogant claim of sinful and unruly man in the place of God to dominate the souls of men. And no grander demonstration that there is a divinity striving hard to shape the destiny of mankind could ever be asked or given than from the day of Cain until now is given in the perpetual heroic assertion and maintenance of this perfect liberty of the individual soul by the individual person against the subtlest pretensions and mightiest combinations of force and power that this world could possibly contrive. From Nimrod to Nebuchadnezzar and

from Nebuchadnezzar until now the course and energy of empire have been bent and exerted to this one thing. And through all that time such splendid individuals as Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Daniel and his three brethren, Paul, Wycliffe, Huss, Militz, Matthias, Conrad, Jerome, Luther, Roger Williams, and multitudes unnamed, and over all Christ Jesus, by divine faith have sublimely stood *alone with God*, absolutely alone so far as man is concerned, for the individuality, and in that the liberty, of the soul of man; and for the sovereignty of God alone in and over the realm of the soul.*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 369.3*

In the Scriptures there are given distinctly and clearly five specific lessons on this subject of religious liberty—the liberty of the individual soul against the domination of man and combinations of men in the powers of the world. Each of these lessons deals with the subject upon a distinct and specific principle. And the five lessons, taken together, cover completely the whole ground upon every principle.*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.1*

We now purpose to take up for special study these five lessons separately and in succession as given in the Scriptures. The contest for religious liberty is not yet finished. Religious liberty complete is not yet recognized, even in principle, and much less in practise, even by the mass of Christians, as it is made perfectly plain in the Scriptures.*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.2*

Come, then, let us study and let us have, and let us study that we may have, religious liberty complete, in principle and in experience, as it is in the Scriptures of truth.*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.3*

The Empire of Babylon embraced the civilized world, as the world then was. Nebuchadnezzar was monarch and absolute ruler of the empire. “Thou, O King, art a King of Kings; for the God of Heaven hath given thee a kingdom, and power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the haven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all.” *Daniel 2:37, 38.**MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.4*

In his own providential purpose God had made all nations subject to

the sway of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon. *Jeremiah 27:1-13*. In the form and system of government of Babylon the authority of the king was absolute. His word was the law. In this absolutism of sovereignty king Nebuchadnezzar assumed that he was sovereign of the souls as well as the bodies, of the religious life as well as the devil conduct, of those who were subject to his power. And since he was ruler of the nations he would be ruler in the religion, and of the religion, of the nations. *MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.5*

Accordingly he made a great image, all of gold, about ninety feet tall and nine feet broad, and “set it up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon.” Then he summoned from the provinces all the officials of the empire to the dedication and the worship of the great golden image. All the officials came, and were assembled and stood before the image. *MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.6*

“Then an herald cried aloud, To you it is commanded, O people, nations, and languages, that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up; and whoso falleth not down and worshippeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace.” And as the instruments of music sounded forth the grand signal for the worship “all the people, the nations, and the languages, fell down and worshipped the golden image.” *Daniel 3:4-6. MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.7*

But in the assembly there were three young Hebrews who had been carried captive from Jerusalem to Babylon, but who had been appointed by the king, officials “over the affairs of the province of Babylon.” These neither bowed nor worshipped, not otherwise paid any particular attention to the proceedings. *MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.8*

This was noticed, and excited accusation before the king. “There are certain Jews whom thou hast set over the affairs of the province of Babylon, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego; these men, O king, have not regarded thee: they serve not thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.” *Verse 12. MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.9*

Then the king “in his rage and fury” commanded that the three young men should be brought before him. This was done. The king himself now spoke to them personally and direct: “Is it of purpose, O Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, do not ye serve my gods, nor worship the golden image which I have set up?” The king himself then repeated the command that at the sound of the instruments of all kinds of music they fall down and worship, and if not, they were to be cast “the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace.”*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.10*

But the young men quietly answered: “O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.” *Verses 14-18.MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.11*

The issue was now clearly drawn. The sovereign of the world’s power had personally issued his command direct to the three individuals; and from them he had received answer as direct, that they would not conform. This was conduct, and these were words, such as the king in his absolutism of power had never met before. There was therefore a personal as well as an official resentment aroused in him; and he was so “full of fury” that “the form of his visage was changed against” the young men, and he commanded that the furnace should be heated seven times hotter than usual, and that “the most mighty men in his army” should bind the young men and cast them into the midst of the roaring furnace.*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.12*

It was done. And the three men, “in their coats, and their hosen, and their hats, and their other garments” fell down bound “into the midst of the burning fiery furnace.” But just then the king was more astonished than ever in his life before. He was fairly petrified —“astonied”—and “rose up in haste” and to his counselors cried out, “Did not we cast *three men bound* into the midst of the fire?”*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.13*

They assured him that this was true. But he exclaimed, “Lo, I see

four men, loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.”MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.14

Then the king went near to the mouth of the furnace and called to the men by name and said, “Ye servants of the most high God, come forth and come hither.” And they “came forth of the midst of the fire.” And the princes, governors, and captains, and the king’s counselors, being gathered together, *saw these men* upon whose bodies the fire had no power, nor was an hair of their head singed, neither were their coats changed, nor the smell of fire had passed upon them.*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.15*

“Then Nebuchadnezzar spoke, and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants that trusted in him, and *have changed the king’s word*, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god, except their own God.”*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.16*

Here, then, is the situation: The Lord had brought all nations in subjection to the king of Babylon. By messages of his own prophet he had commanded his people, the Jews, and these three young men among them to “serve the king of Babylon.” Yet these three had explicitly refused to serve the king of Babylon in this thing which he had personally and directly commanded them; and in this refusal the Lord himself had most signally stood by them and delivered them.*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.17*

Therefore it would be impossible more plainly to show that the Lord, in commanding the people to be subject to the king of Babylon and to serve him, had never either commanded or intended that they should be subject to him or serve him *in the realm of religion*.*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.18*

By this unmistakable approval of the course of the three men, and this signal deliverance of them, the Lord made perfectly plain to the king that his command in this matter was wrong; that he had demanded a service that he had no right to require; that in making him king of the nations the Lord had not made him king in *the religion* of the people; that in bringing him to be head of all the

nations, peoples, and languages, God had not given him to be head of the religion of even a solitary individual; that while the Lord had brought all nations and peoples under the king's yoke as to their political and bodily service, this same Lord had unmistakably shown to the king that he had given no power nor jurisdiction in any way whatever in their soul's service; that while in all things between nation and nation, and between man and man, all peoples, nations, and languages had been given to him to serve him, and had made him ruler over them all; yet in the things between each man and God the king could have nothing whatever to do; and that in the presence of the rights of the individual person, in conscience and in worship "the king's word" *must change*, the king's decree is naught; that in this the king even of the world is only nobody, for here only God is sovereign and all in all.*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 370.19*

And for the instruction of all kings and all people, forever, all this was done that day, and it was written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come.*MEDM November 20, 1907, page 371.1*

December 4, 1907

“Religious Liberty—II. As Related to the Supremacy of the Law” The Medical Missionary, 16, 49, pp. 385, 386.

ATJ

BY ALONZO T. JONES

THE world power and empire of Babylon passed away forever; and another took its place—the power and empire of Medo-Persia. Here was another principle of government, and here there is given to the world another lesson in religious liberty.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 385.1*

In the Medo-Persian empire the principle of government was different from that of Babylon.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 385.2*

Babylon, as we have seen, was not only an absolute monarchy, but an autocracy—a one-man government, a one-man absolutism. The word of the kings was the law, and the law was changeable as the will and word of the king might change. The king was the source of the law; his word was the law for all others, but as for himself there was no restriction of law.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 385.3*

The Medo-Persian government was an absolute monarchy also. There, also, the word of the king was the law, but with this all-important difference from Babylon, that when once the word of the king had gone forth as the law, that law could not be changed nor reversed even by the king himself. The king himself was bound, even against himself, by his own word or decree that had once become the law. The government of Medo-Persia, therefore, was a government of law; its principle was the supremacy of THE LAW.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 385.4*

At the head of the administration of the affairs of this empire there were three presidents, of whom Daniel was first. Because of Daniel's knowledge, integrity, ability, and general worth in the administration the king had it in mind "to set him over the whole realm." This, becoming known, excited the jealousy of the other two

presidents and of the princes; and they conspired to break him down.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 385.5*

They sought, first, “to find occasion against Daniel” concerning his conduct of the affairs of the empire. But after long and diligent search, and the closest possible scrutiny, they were obliged to cease their endeavor and confess that “they could find none occasion nor fault;” because “he was faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him.”*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 385.6*

“Then said these men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God.” But they could not find any occasion against him concerning even the law of his God, until they themselves had first created a situation that would render inevitable the desired occasion.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 385.7*

Their long and exacting endeavor to *find* come [*sic.*] occasion or fault against him in the affairs of the empire, had convinced them of his absolute devotion in loyalty to God. Through their investigation they knew by experience that he could not by any means be caused to swerve a hair’s-breadth from the straight line of absolute devotion to God. But this was wholly an individual matter, in which there was no interference with any man in any way whatever. And in in [*sic.*] his conduct in relation to others and to the State, their own consciously prejudiced investigation had demonstrated that it was actually beneficial.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 385.8*

Thus there being no possible ground upon which they could find occasion against him even concerning the law of his God, as circumstances and conditions were; and they, therefore, being put to the necessity of actually creating such ground Daniel’s unswerving devotion to God became the way over which they would proceed. They therefore concocted a scheme into which they drew all the officials of the empire, and went to the king and said:—“O king, live forever. All the presidents of the kingdom, the governors, and the princes, the counsellors, and the captains, have consulted together to establish a royal statute, and to make a firm decree, that whosoever shall ask a petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of thee, O king, he shall be cast into the den of lions. Now, O

king, establish the decree, and sign the writing, that it be not changed, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not.” *Daniel 6:6-8.MEDM December 4, 1907, page 385.9*

The king allowed himself to be caught by this very flattering proposal of so large a number of the highest officials of the empire; and he signed the decree. Daniel knew that the decree had been framed, and that the writing had been signed by the king. He knew that such was now the law of the empire—a law that could neither be changed nor altered. Nevertheless he went to his house, and as his regular times of prayer recurred, three times a day, he “prayed and gave thanks before God, as he did aforetime.” And his windows happening to be open, the imperial law had not enough place in his mind or weight upon his attention to induce him to take the precaution even to close the windows.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 385.10*

The plotters expecting nothing but just this on the part of Daniel, “assembled and found Daniel praying and making supplication before his God.” Then at sight of this open disregard of the imperial law, they hastened to the king and very deferentially inquired. “Hast thou not signed a decree,” etc? The king answered. “The thing is true, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not.” Then the plotters reported, “that Daniel which is of the children of the captivity of Judah, regardeth not thee, O king, nor the decree that thou hast signed, but maketh his petition three times a day.”*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 385.11*

“Then the king, when he had heard these words, was sore displeased *with himself*,” because he had allowed himself to be so flattered as to be caught in such a trap as that. “And he set his heart on Daniel to deliver him.” But the plotters were ready with their plea of the supremacy and integrity of “the law”; and to urge arguments that it was “not a question of religion, but of the law;” that to countenance disregard and violation of “the law” was simply to undermine all the government and make an open bid for a reign of anarchy, and for the very dissolution of society itself; that they were exceedingly sorry that such an excellent man as Daniel should be thus involved, yet to allow such open disregard of “the law” by one of such high standing and reputation would be only all the worse,

because this very fact of the high standing and wide reputation of the one who so openly disregarded “the law” would be only the more encouragement to all people to do the same, etc., etc.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 385.12*

Yet the king “labored till the going down of the sun to deliver him.” But through all that time and at every turn, the king was met by the plotters with the plea, “The law; the law.” “Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, that no decree nor statute which the king establisheth may be changed.” The supremacy of the law bound the king himself; there was no escape; and, though with greatest reluctance, “the king commanded and they brought Daniel, and cast him into the den of lions.”*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 386.1*

The king passed the night in fasting and in sleeplessness. But very early in the morning he hurried to the den of lions and “cried with a lamentable voice unto Daniel ... O Daniel servant of the living God, is thy God, whom thou servest continually, able to deliver thee from the lions?”*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 386.2*

Daniel answered, “O king, live forever. My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions’ mouths that they have not hurt me; forasmuch as *before Him*, innocency was found in me; and also *before thee*, O king, have I done no hurt.” And therein the demonstration is made in perfection forever that the person who disregards any law that touches service to God *is innocent before God*, and also does “no hurt” to the king, nor to the state, nor the society, nor to any principle of law or government.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 386.3*

All of which in divine truth demonstrates again that no earthly government can ever have the right or jurisdiction in matters of *religion*; that is, in “the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it.” And in *this* case there is the additional demonstration that no government can ever of right incorporate *in the law* provisions touching *religion*, and then plead the supremacy and integrity of “the law;” that “it is not primarily a question of *religion* but only of *the law*,” that “we are not asking for religious observance, we ask only *respect for law*.” In the case of Daniel and

the “supremacy of the law of the Medes and the Persians,” the divine answer to all such pleas is that, nothing pertaining to religion can ever of right have any place in the law.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 386.4*

The right of perfect individuality in religion is a divine, and therefore an absolutely inalienable, right. And to make religious observations or prohibitions a matter of the law, does not affect the free exercise of this divine right. The fulness of the right, and the perfect liberty of its exercise, abides ever the same, even though religion be made a matter, and a part of the law. And when religion or religious observance or prohibition is fixed in the law, even though the law be as supreme and inflexible as that of the Medes and Persians, the divine right and perfect liberty of individuality in religion then extends *to the law that incorporates the religion*, and such law is simply no law. The subterfuge of enforcing religious observances or prohibitions under cover of “the supremacy and integrity of the law,” instead of taking away or in any way limiting the divine right and perfect liberty of individuality in religion, simply reacts to the extent of actually sweeping away all ground of claim for “the supremacy and integrity of the law”—in actually nullifying the specific law in the case.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 386.5*

The civil law is rightly supreme in the realm of things civil, but in the realm of things religious it simply has no place at all.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 386.6*

In the presence of the divine right of individuality in religion as relates to autocratic government, illustrated in King Nebuchadnezzar, *the King’s word must change*.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 386.7*

In the presence of the divine right of individuality in religion as relates to the supremacy and inflexibility of the law, illustrated in the government of the Medes and Persians, any law that touches or contemplates religion is simply no law at all.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 386.8*

The realm of religion is the realm of God. In that realm—God alone is Sovereign, and his will is the only law. And in that realm the individual stands alone with God, and responsible to him

alone.*MEDM December 4, 1907, page 386.9*

December 11, 1907

“Religious Liberty—III. As Related to the Supremacy of the Law” The Medical Missionary, 16, 50, pp. 397-399.

ATJ

BY ALONZO T. JONES

BY most remarkable facts and unquestionable experiences, in the case of King Nebuchadnezzar and the three Hebrew young men, there was made plain for ever the divine truth and principle that with the religion of the people no monarch can of right have anything to do; that in the presence of the right of individuality in religion, the king's word must change.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 397.1*

By corresponding facts and experiences in the case of the Medo-Persian government against Daniel there was made plain forever the divine will and truth and principle that with the religion of the people no law, nor any government by means of law, can of right have anything to do—that in the presence of the free exercise of individuality in religion, any law teaching religion is nothing; and every individual in absolutely ignoring and disregarding such law is “innocent” before God, and also does “no hurt” to government, to law, or to society.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 397.2*

These two examples and the principles which they illustrate cover every phase of earthly government as such, and so make plain the great and vital truth that religion, with its rites, institutions, and observances, is totally excluded, and is to be totally exempt, from the cognizance of earthly government of whatever phase or form; that religion, with all that is incident to it, pertains to the individual lone in his personal relations to God.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.1*

But there is another means by which man has sought to dominate man in the realm of religion, that is by means of *the Church through the State*.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.2*

People called out from the world and separated from the world unto God, are his church in the world. When God had called his people

out of Egypt they were first “the church in the wilderness” and afterward in the land of Canaan they were the church there.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.3*

Through their stiffness of neck, hardness of heart, and blindness of mind, they sadly missed God’s great purpose for them as his church. Yet in his goodness and mercy God suffered their manners in the “wilderness,” and in the land from age to age. Thus through many vicissitudes that people and continued as the church till the time when Christ the Lord came to dwell on the earth; and through all that time this church was heir to most glorious promises of a widespread kingdom and dominion.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.4*

At the time when Christ came to the earth as man, the dominion and power of Rome held the people of that church in stern and cruel temporal subjection, and they longed for the promised Deliverer to appear. This Deliverer had been abundantly promised, and at last he came. But the high ones of the church had allowed their worldly ambition to hide their eyes from the spirituality of the kingdom and dominion that had been promised; and they looked for, and had taught the people to expect, a political and temporal deliverer who should strike off the yoke of Rome, break her power, and exalt the church of the chosen people to a position of power and dominion over the nations, corresponding to that which for so long had been held by the nations over them.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.5*

When Jesus first appeared in his public ministry, these high ones of the church went with the crowds that flocked to hear him, listened with interest, and hoped that he would fulfil their expectations. But when they saw the interest and enthusiasm of the multitude reached the point where “they would come and take him by force to make him a king”; and when they saw that Jesus, instead of accepting the honor or encouraging the project, “withdrew himself from them”; in this they also saw that all their ambitious hopes of deliverance from the dominion of Rome, and of exaltation over the nations were utterly vain so far as Jesus was concerned.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.6*

But by this time the influence of Jesus with the people had become so widespread and so strong that the church-leaders saw that their rapidly vanishing; instead of seeing fulfilled or sanctioned their ambitions, plans, and hopes for worldly power and dominion, they saw with dismay that what power and influence they did have with the people was most certainly undermined. And this by a man risen from the greatest obscurity, who came from a town of the meanest reputation, and who was at most only a private member of the church. Something must be done, and that very soon, to preserve their own place and dignity. It was manifestly too late to think of commanding him not to preach or teach; by this time they knew full well that not only he but the multitudes themselves would pay no attention to any such prohibition. But there was a way out—a means by which to maintain their place and dignity, and to assert their power over him and the people. In their opinion of themselves and their position, it was a very easy thing to make their place and dignity identical not only with the position but with the very existence of the church and even the nation itself. Accordingly they concluded, “If we let him thus alone all men will believe on him and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.” And “from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death.”*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.7*

But subject as they were to the Roman authority, it was not lawful for them to put any man to death. Therefore, to effect their purpose they must get control of the governmental or civic authority. It mattered not that this authority was Roman; and it mattered not that this Roman authority they hated above all other earthly things, and could not by any possibility willingly recognize; all this must be forgotten in the presence of the awful alternative of seeing vanish their place and dignity and power in the church.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.8*

In the church the Pharisees and the Herodians stood at opposite poles. The Herodians were so called because they were the party and partisans of Herod. They were the apologists for Herod in his position of king of Judea. But as Herod was king only by the direct appointment of Rome, and was seated and maintained as king by the power of Rome, for any one to be a partisan and an apologist of Herod was to be even more a partisan and an apologist of

Rome.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.9*

The Pharisees were the exclusively righteous ones of the church. They were the extreme church party. As such they were the conservators of the purity of the church, the representatives of the truest loyalty to God and the ancient dignity of the chosen people. As such they were the extreme and most uncompromising dissidents from Rome, and from all that was of Rome or that was in any way connected with Rome.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.10*

But the Pharisees, as the exclusively righteous ones and the chiefest in dignity, were the most fixedly set against Christ, and took the lead in the counsels and plans to destroy him. And to accomplish their purpose to put him to death, they must have the co-operation of the secular power, which was Roman only. Therefore to accomplish their purpose against Jesus, they would glaze their hatred for Rome, and would use for their purpose against Jesus that very power of Rome of which they were by profession the extreme disputers and opposers.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.11*

The means by which at one stride they would both cross this gulf to Rome and make sure of the secular power, was to join issues with the Herodians. The Herodians, as being only less opposed to Jesus than were the Pharisees, were ready for the alliance. By this alliance the political party would be at one with the Pharisees, and the political influence and power of that party would be at the command of the church lovers. This would make sure to them the use of the soldiery, which they must have if they would be really secure in their open movements against Jesus.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.12*

The alliance was entered into, and the conspiracy was formed: "And the Pharisees went forth and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against him, *how they might destroy him.*" *Mark 3:6.* "Then went the Pharisees and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians," "spies, which should feign themselves just men, that they might take hold of his words, that so *they might*

deliver him unto the power and authority of the governor.” Matthew 22:15, 16; Luke 20:20. And that governor was Pilate the Roman.MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.13

And when finally the time came, at that awful midnight hour when Judas, “having received” a band of men and a captain and officers, “with swords,” came upon him in Gethsemane, it was “the band and the captain, and the officers,” who, at the direction of “the chief priests and Pharisees,” took him and bound him.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 398.14*

And having so taken him they led him to Annas first. Annas sent him to Caiaphas, and Caiaphas sent him to Pilate the governor, the Roman. Pilate sent him to Herod, who “with his men of war” set him at naught and mocked him and arrayed him in a gorgeous robe and sent him again to Pilate, “And when Pilate would have let him go, they rung their final political note and plea of *loyalty to Cesar and Rome*, even above the loyalty of Pilate and the Roman himself, “If thou let this man go thou art not Cesar’s friend. Whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cesar.”*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 399.1*

Pilate made his last appeal, “Shall I crucify your king?” only to be answered with the words expressive of their final abandonment of God and their completest unity with Rome, “We have no king but Caesar. Crucify him. Crucify him. And they were instant with loud voices. And the voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed.”*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 399.2*

Thus the mightiest crime and the loudest crying sin in all the history of the universe was committed, and was made possible as it was committed, only by the union of church and State—only by the church in control of the civil power, using to make effective her wicked will and purpose.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 399.3*

And that awful fact alone is all-sufficient to blast with perpetual and infinite condemnation and to consign to eternal infamy all such connection anywhere forever. And with such a record in the very first instance of the thing, it is not at all strange that this same thing of union of church and state—the church in control of the secular power—should have proved and must ever prove, the chiefest

curse to men and nations wherever found in all after times.*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 399.4*

So true it is, and so completely demonstrated, that “secular power has proved a Satanic gift to the church.”*MEDM December 11, 1907, page 399.5*

December 25, 1907

“Religious Liberty—IV. As Related to the Church Itself” The Medical Missionary, 16, 52, pp. 413, 414.

ATJ

ALONZO T. JONES

WE have seen that no monarchial government has any right to enforce or require any religious observance; and that when any such power does so, the right of individuality in religion is supreme, and the monarch's word must change.*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 413.1*

We have found also that no government in which the law is supreme has any right to put into the law of the realm any statute, decree, or provision touching religion; and that when such a thing is done, the right of individuality in religion remains supreme, and innocency before God, and perfect harmlessness before the government, the law, and society is found in him who disregards such law.*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 413.2*

We have found that the church has no right to control the civil power for the execution of her will or the furtherance of her aims; and that when she does so a connection of crowning iniquity is formed, only a Satanic gift is in the possession of such church, and the right of individuality in religion is still supreme and to be freely exercised.*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 413.3*

There is yet another combination by means of which domination of man in religion has been sought; this is *the church itself*, within itself—the church as relates to the membership of the church. And upon this, whether in principle, or in facts of remarkable experience, the Scripture is no less explicit than in any other of the examples given on this subject.*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 413.4*

It has been already related how that Israel when delivered from Egypt was first “the church in the wilderness” and afterward in the land of Canaan; and that this same Israel in the days of Christ on earth, though in spirit and substance far short of God's ideal for

them, yet in fact was still the church in direct descent.*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 413.5*

The official organization of this church was also still in fact the same in direct descent. The priesthood—the chief priests, and the high priest—in order and in succession, were the direct continuance in succession of the order established by the Lord through Moses in the wilderness; and was just as truly the church in descent from the church in the wilderness.*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 413.6*

And the apostle of the Lord and the original disciples of Jesus were all, without exception, members of that church. They took part equally with others in the services and worship of that church. They went to the temple and into the temple with all the others to worship at the regular hours, and they taught in the temple (*Acts 2:46; 3:1; 5:12*); and the people were... the approval of... upon them all.*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 413.7*

But those apostles and... learned something and knew... truth that the high ones of the church did not know and would not recognize. Therefore they preached Jesus and the resurrection, and salvation through Him, and that there is no other way—that very Jesus of whom the official order and organization of the church had “now been the betrayers and murderers.” Therefore this official order and organization of the church assumed the office and prerogative of deciding that those private church-members should neither preach nor teach this truth that they knew to be the truth.*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 413.8*

Accordingly the priests and the temple authorities arrested Peter and John and put them in prison; when they had gone up to the temple at the hour of prayer, and the lame man had been healed through faith in the name of Jesus, and Peter had preached to the assembled wondering people. Then the next morning all the official order and organization of the church—the rulers, the seventy elders, the scribes, the priests, and the high priest—gathered together and had Peter and John brought and set in the midst, and demanded of them what authority they had to be preaching: “By what power, and by what name, have you done this?”*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 413.9*

Then Peter “filled with the Holy Ghost” made answer. The whole assembly “marveled” at the boldness of these two only common and illiterate members of the church in the presence of that official and august body, “and they took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus.” Peter and John were remanded outside the council, while the council “conferred among themselves.”*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 413.10*

In their conference they decided, “Let us straitly threaten them that they speak henceforth to no man in this name.” Then they called in again Peter and John “and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus.” But Peter and John answered immediately, “Whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard.” In that answer so promptly given, it seemed to that assembly that these mere common men and private and illiterate members of the church, would actually convey the impression that it was possible for such as they to be taught of God, and to know from God things that this whole assembly of the highest officials and most learned ones of the church did not know; and they would pay no attention whatever to the command of ...would go right ahead... that the council might.... Plainly enough such a ... could mean only every one for himself, an individual independence that would overthrow all order and authority.*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 413.11*

Such an answer as that from such persons as those, to such an official and dignified body as this; such an answer from mere common persons to this august assembly, from mere private members of the church to the regular assemblage of that which for ages had been the highest official and divinely appointed order in the organization of the church; could not be considered by those officials as anything less than arrant presumption, and the destruction of all order and organization in the church.*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 414.1*

However, the council let them go, with further charge under heavy threat that they should so teach no more.*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 414.2*

Peter and John being let go went to the company of the other disciples and “reported all that the chief priests and elders had said unto them.” And all the others, instead of being in the least awed or more afraid by it, not only decidedly approved what Peter and John had done, but were so glad of it that “with one accord” they thanked and praised God, asked Him to “behold the threatenings of the church officials and grant to *all* of the disciples boldness that they may speak thy word.” And God witnessed to their Christian steadfastness, “and the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and *they spake the word of God with boldness.*” “And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of man and women.”*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 414.3*

This open disobedience to the “authority” of the church, this bold “disregard for established order and organization? could not be allowed to go on. Therefore *all* the apostles were next arrested and imprisoned; for “then the high priest rose up, and all they that were with him, and were filled with indignation, and laid hands on the apostles and put them in the common prison.”*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 414.4*

But lo! “*the angel of the Lord* by night opened the prison doors, and brought them forth and said, Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life. And when they heard that, they entered into the temple early in the morning and taught.”*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 414.5*

That same morning the high priest and they that were with him “called the council together, and *all the senate of the children of Israel*, and sent to the prison” to have the apostles brought before them to answer for all this “insubordination,” “apostasy” and “opposition to the organized work” of the church. The messengers returned and reported that they found the prison securely closed and the keepers on guard, but there were no prisoners. But while those of the council were wondering what this could mean, there came one saying that the men were “standing in the temple and teaching the people.”*MEDM December 25, 1907, page 414.6*

Officers were sent who arrested them all anew and brought them

before the council. The high priest demanded of them, "Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine." *MEDM December 25, 1907, page 414.7*

The apostles answered as before: "We ought to obey God rather than man. The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel with forgiveness of sins. And we are witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey Him." *MEDM December 25, 1907, page 414.8*

At this bold persistence in the forbidden course the council "took counsel to slay them." From actually murdering the apostles the council was dissuaded by Gamaliel. Nevertheless, the council called in the apostles again, and "had them flogged" and then again "commanded that they should not speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go." *MEDM December 25, 1907, page 414.9*

The apostles departed from the presence of the council. But instead of being either awed or subdued by the council or by what it had done, they were all only glad again to be counted worthy to suffer stripes and whatever other disgrace from the official organization of the church for teaching what they saw and knew to be the truth. And notwithstanding that it was "all the senate of the children of Israel," that is, all those who composed the official organization of the church, that had so treated them and had repeatedly commanded them not to preach at all nor teach the things which they were both preaching and teaching, "never for a single day, either in the temple or in the private houses, did they discontinue teaching or telling the good news of Jesus the Christ." *MEDM December 25, 1907, page 414.10*

(To be Continued.)

